

तमसो मा ज्योतिर्गमय

SANTINIKETAN  
VISWA BHARATI  
LIBRARY

277

N 26

Vol. 5









GENERAL HISTORY  
OF THE  
CHRISTIAN RELIGION AND CHURCH

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF

DR. AUGUSTUS NEANDER,

BY

JOSEPH TORREY,

PROFESSOR OF MORAL PHILOSOPHY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT.

NEW EDITION, CAREFULLY REVISED.

I am come to send fire on the earth."—*Words of our Lord.*  
And the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is." "But other foundation  
can no man lay than that is laid, which is Christ Jesus."—*St. Paul.*

VOLUME FIFTH.

LONDON:  
HENRY G. BOHN, YORK STREET, COVENT GARDEN.

1851.

LONDON: PRINTED BY W. CLOWES AND SONS, STAMFORD STREET.

( v )

## DEDICATION OF THE THIED VOLUME.

TO MY HONOURED FRIEND,  
THE REVEREND JOSEPH BLANCO WHITE, OF DUBLIN,  
A PRESBYTER OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

I DEDICATE this volume, my dear sir, to you, in token of the fellowship of mind and heart existing between us—a fellowship springing out of our common consciousness of that evangelical truth which, fitted and designed to unite all men together in one community, begets friendship on both sides the ocean between those who, by the eye of the spirit, can recognise each other as kinsmen and brethren, though they have never seen each other face to face. And as we are united by the consciousness of that truth which for eighteen centuries has been at work to found among all mankind a fellowship which will destroy all separating intervals of time and space, so are we more particularly bound together by our peculiar mode of apprehending that truth, resulting from the history of our lives, which, differing as they do in other respects, resemble each other in this—that they have run through the same opposite extremes, agitating the times in which we live; as well as by our common conviction of what it is which constitutes the essence of the gospel, and of its relation to the changing forms of human culture. Out of your struggle with superstition and infidelity, with dogmatism and scepticism, you have reached and found repose in the settled conviction that, as in your last work you finely express it, the essence of Christianity consists not so much in the revelation of a new speculative theory or system of morality, as in the bestowment of a new divine life fitted to penetrate and refine, from its inmost centre, man's entire nature, with all its powers and capacities, and also to give a new direction to all human thought and action. This divine principle of life is one which ever retains the freshness and vigour of youth; while dogmatic systems, dependent on the changing forms of culture among men, become superannuated. Humanity, as it advances in years, by this principle of the new life continually grows young again. From this divine life comes the consciousness which conquers doubt, which dissipates *σκέψεις* and *προσωπαγεῖς*, which overcomes all difficulties; while human science ever continues to be a patch-work, as it cannot deny without contradicting itself.

to exhibit the progressive evolution and purification of this divine life within the whole compass of humanity, on the sides of thought and of action, is precisely the task which the present work, feebly and imperfectly as it may be done, aims to accomplish ; and because you perceive this to be its aim and tendency, you have expressed your agreement with it. May the Spirit of God ever keep us thus united, that so with the greater energy we may till the last breath of life bear witness of this Divine life which Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of God, and Saviour of sinful mankind, has bestowed ; that we may promote, cherish, and refine it both in ourselves and in others ; that we may contend with it and for it, against scepticism and dogmatism, against the pride and presumption of a false philosophy, and the arrogant idolatry of mere notions of the human understanding.

Berlin, Oct. 4th, 1834.

A. NEANDER.

## DEDICATION OF THE FOURTH VOLUME

TO MY BELOVED FRIEND AND COLLEAGUE,

DR. TWESTEN.

WHEN I dedicated to you a volume of this work some years ago, my inward motive was, the consciousness of our spiritual fellowship, as Christians and theologians ; while at the same time the outward occasion was presented in the pleasure I had of greeting you here again, and of being able to compare our views with regard to many points, on the spot where our ancient friendship first commenced. And then again, when one of my dearest wishes seemed likely, though by a painful occasion, to be fulfilled, and I was promising myself the satisfaction of being permitted to labour with you for the kingdom of God in a closer collegiate union, I felt desirous of dedicating to you the third volume of my Church History by way of saluting you as my colleague. I omitted to do so, because I was unwilling to anticipate a decision of which I had not as yet been certainly assured. Since then, you have followed the call of the Lord, which invited you to join us ; and since then, I have experienced and enjoyed, amid the jars and divisions of an all-separating, all-isolating period, the rich and manifold blessing of our collegial connection. First of all, then, I would thank God for this. I would thank him, that he led you to us ; for in such a time of the breaking

DEDICATION OF THE FOURTH VOLUME.

up of old foundations, in such a period of ferment, we do indeed especially need theologians who can with calmness and composure, with firmness and freedom, pursue right onward through the oppositions which agitate the times, that true middle course, which is not to be found by falling in with every tendency of the good and the evil spirit of the age, but which the pure and simple truth of the gospel presents of itself, as the only way ultra quod citaque nequit consistere rectum ;—men who seek after nothing but the simple truth, and who would let this have its sway ; who have received from above that disposition which will not allow them to comply with the wishes of those for whom this simple truth is not good enough, nor to humour that sickly tendency of a false culture and excitement which can be satisfied only with the piquant and the striking. May God, therefore, who has bestowed this blessing on you, preserve your health and strength to work amongst us yet many years by your science and your life, in this spirit, for his kingdom ; and may he give you to enjoy an ever increasing pleasure and delight in this work. May he bless also our union, and cause us to be mutual help, as becomes Christian friends to be, to each other, by strengthening each other's hands, encouraging each other's hearts, and correcting each other's errors. May he enable us to labour together for one common end, even that—to use the language of the great Erasmus—ut Christus ille purus atque simplex inseratur mentibus hominum, an end to which science itself must also be subservient.

Yours, with my whole heart,

*Berlin, June 10th, 1836.*

NEANDER.

## PREFACE TO THE THIRD VOLUME.

IN presenting to the public this third volume of my Church History, I beg leave to remark that it would have given me great pleasure if I had found it possible to conclude in this volume my account of the image-controversy; but in considering the immense mass of the materials, I have thought best to reserve the second part of this controversy for the next succeeding period, where it chronologically belongs. The thread of events which in this period served to prepare the way for the schism betwixt the Greek and the Latin church, I shall take up again in the genetic exposition of this controversy in the following period.

Through the obliging assistance of my friend Dr. Petermann, whose praiseworthy efforts have opened the way for establishing among us a chair of Armenian literature, I have been enabled here and there to avail myself of Armenian sources of information hitherto unexplored.

May the indefatigable labours of this estimable man, in a field which promises so rich a harvest, meet with the a knowledge and the patronage they so eminently deserve.

*Berlin, Oct. 4th, 1834.*

A. N.

## PREFACE TO THE FOURTH VOLUME.

GOD be thanked, that he has enabled me to complete this new and important section of the present work, and to approach the flourishing period of the middle ages.

I cannot forbear expressing my hearty acknowledgments to Councillor Reuss of Gottingen, and to Mr. Kopitar, keeper of the Imperial library in Vienna, for the kind assistance they have rendered me on several points of literary inquiry. Mr. Kopitar has shown the distinguished kindness of sending me from his private library the Greek work mentioned in the course of my narrative, with the request that, after having made such use of it as I needed for myself, I should place it in the royal library of this city for the use of other inquirers.

I must also express my obligations to Dr. Petermann for the extracts with which he has furnished me from books published only in the Armenian language.

*Berlin, June 10th, 1836.*

NEANDER.

## CONTENTS OF VOL. V.

### THIRD PERIOD OF THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

FROM THE ROMAN BISHOP GREGORY THE GREAT  
TO THE DEATH OF THE EMPEROR CHARLEMAGNE; OR FROM  
A.D. 590 TO A.D. 814.

#### INTRODUCTORY REMARKS, p. 1--4.

Page

POWER AND INFLUENCE OF CHRISTIANITY IN THIS PERIOD AS COMPARED WITH THE FORMER PERIODS. CORRUPTING ELEMENTS OF CHURCH-TRADITION. REACTION AGAINST THEM. SOURCE OF THESE CORRUPTING ELEMENTS. EX- TENT TO WHICH THE OLD TESTAMENT NOTIONS OF CHRISTIANITY TENDED TO PROMOTE ITS PROGRESS . . . .	1--3
--	------

#### SECTION FIRST.

##### RELATION OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH TO THE WORLD. ITS EXTENSION AND LIMITATION, 4--145.

###### 1. *In Europe*, 4--115.

Means for the diffusion of Christianity . . . . .	4--5
Burgundians, their Arianism. Activity of the Arians (note).	
Avitus of Vienne. Gundobad. Disputation (499). Bur- gundians embrace the Nicene creed in the time of Sieges- mund (517) . . . . .	4--5
Franks. Conversion of Clovis (496), how prepared. Its influ- ence. Ampulla Remensis. Foreign admixtures in the Frank church. Childebert's law against idolatry (554). Regeneration of the Frank church by means of Britain and Ireland . . . . .	
Ireland, abounds in monasteries, <i>insula sanctorum</i> , study of the Bible, mission-schools. Abbot Comgal founds Bangor. Nynias among the southern, Columba among the Northern Picts (565). Monastery on the island of Hy or St. Iona. St. Columba . . . . .	6--12
	12

Page	
12—25	<i>British church.</i> Corruption in it (Gildas). <i>Britons call in the Anglo-Saxons.</i> 'Anglo-Saxon Heptarchy.' Gregory the Great. Ethelbert king of Kent, his Christian wife Bertha. Abbot Augustin sent by Gregory to the Anglo-Saxons (596). His reception by Ethelbert. Settles down in Canterbury. Apparent miracles. Ethelbert's baptism and conduct after it. Gregory's principles touching conversion (note). Augustin ordained bishop by Etherich of Arles. Lawrence and Peter sent to Rome. Gregory's prudent advice to Augustin. He sends abbot Mellitus with monks to England. Augustin made archbishop. Diversity of ecclesiastical usages in Gaul and in the Romish church. Gregory's view of it. Gregory on idol-temples and festivals; determines to make London and York seats of archbishoprics. Sabereth of East Saxony. Mellitus archbishop of London. Gregory's view of his power in the Western church. Augustin's attempt to extend his primacy over the ancient British abbot Deynoch of Bangor. Conference between Augustin and British bishops. Natural hatred of Britons and Anglo-Saxons. Augustin's death (605), his successor Lawrence. Ethelbert's death (616). His son Eadbald an idolator. Suppression of Christianity in Essex. Bishop Mellitus driven away. Vision of Lawrence. Fadbald converted and baptized.
25—30	<i>Northumberland.</i> Edwin and Ethelberga. Paulinus bishop of York. Assembly of nobles, convened to deliberate on the affairs of religion, decides in favour of Christianity. Edwin dies (633); Oswald restorer of the kingdom and the church; Aidan of St. Iona. Oswald's death (642); respect paid to his memory. Spread of Christianity through all the provinces of the Heptarchy. Sussex: Wilfrid of York.
30—33	<i>Difference in the ecclesiastical institutions of the Britannico-Scottish and of the Romish church.</i> Bede on the Scottish missionaries. Contrariety of usage in the celebration of Easter under bishop Aidan. Triumph of the constitution of the Romish church. Synodus Pharensis (664). The Scottish bishop Colemann and the presbyter Wilfrid. Theodore of Canterbury and the abbot Hadrian. Council at Hertford (673).
30—33	<i>Germany.</i> Seeds of Christianity scattered there at an earlier period. Severinus—his descent (note) and place of residence—his activity and influence. Labours of pious Eremites. Goar. Wulfbach. Great activity of the Irish missionaries. Monkish colonies. Abbot Columban's labours in the Frank empire. Anegrey. Luxeuil. Fontaine. Columban's rule—his trials—his opinion touching the diversities of ecclesiastical usages. Banished by Brunehault and Thierri II. from the Burgundian do-

## CONTENTS OF VOL. V.

xi

	Page
minions—his wanderings. Willimar. Gallus. Columban in Italy—his conduct towards the Romish church. Labours and death of Gallus (640). Magnoald. Fridolin. Thredpert. Kyllena (Cilian). . . . .	33—51
<i>Bavaria</i> . Mastasius and Agil. False doctrines of Photinus and Bonosus among the Waraskians, Bavarians, and Burgundians. Emeran. Rudbert (Rupert). Corbinian .	51—54
<i>Frieslanders</i> ; their territory. Amandus (ex. 679). Eligius (ex. 629). Livin (ex. 656). Englishmen receive their education in Irish monasteries. Egbert. Wigbert. Willibord. The brothers Heuwald. Svidbert among the Boruchtuarians. Pipin of Heristal. Willibord, archbishop of Wilteburg (Utrecht). Wulfram of Sens. Radbad (ex. 719). Willibord in Denmark and Heligoland (ex. 739). Wursing Ado. Charles Martel. Circumstances favourable to the missionaries in Germany .	54—62
Boniface (Winfrid, 680—755), <i>father of the German church and civilization</i> —his birth and education—first journey to Friesland (715), Utrecht and Rome (718). Gregory II.—his residence in Thuringia and Utrecht (719)—his second journey to Thuringia and Hessa (722). Boniface in Rome (723)—his confession of faith, ordination, and oath. Important consequences of this oath to the German church. Boniface, as compared with the missionaries from Ireland. Boniface in Hessa and Thuringia—his mode of labouring and its success. The oak of Geismar. Boniface makes provision for the religious instruction of the people. Advice of Daniel of Worcester on this subject. Boniface's sermons and biblical studies. Attention bestowed by him on spiritual culture. Opponents of Boniface. Boniface in Rome (739) and Bavaria. Bishoprics in that country. Death of Charles Martel (741). Charlemagne and Pipin. New bishoprics (742). Institution of provincial synods. Errorists. Adelbert Desiderius, mentioned by Gregory of Tours (note). Boniface's report about him. Respect paid to Adelbert—his followers. Adelbert's arrest. Clement opposed to the authority of the church-fathers and councils—in favour of the marriage of bishops and opposed to the customary hindrances to marriage. Boniface on hindrances to marriage arising from the relations of god-parents and god-children. Clement's view of the <i>descensus</i> and of the doctrine of predestination. Just conduct of pope Zacharias towards Adelbert and Clement (747). Ultimate fortunes of these men. Controversy of Boniface with Virgilius—with Samon. Frankness of Boniface towards pope Zacharias with regard to abuses existing in the Romish church. Efforts of Boniface to establish a fixed ecclesiastical organization. Boniface nominated archbishop (732)—wishes	

	Page
to have Cologne for his metropolis. Gerold and Gewilieb of Mentz. Mentz made an archbishopric. Wish of Boniface to confer the archiepiscopal dignity on his disciple Lull. Decision of the pope. Pipin anointed king by Boniface (752). Solitude shown by Boniface for the English church. Synod for reform at Cloveshove (747). Lull consecrated bishop. Letter of Boniface to Fulrad—his controversy with Hildegard bishop of Cologne. Boniface in Friesland (755)—his martyrdom (5th June, 755) . . . . .	62—99
Disciples of Boniface. Gregory in Friesland—abbot of a monastery in Utrecht—his death (781). Abbot Sturm, founder of the monastery of Hersfeld (736) and Fulda (744)—his residence in Italy—his labours and death (779) . . . . .	99—103
Saxony. resistance to Christianity there, increased by the ill-chosen means for converting the people. Prudent counsels of abbot Aeluin. Peace of Selz (804). Forced conversion of individuals. Severe laws. Liudger, labours in Friesland, on Heligoland, in the territory around Münster—is made bishop (ex. 809). Willehad among the Frieslanders and Saxons—in the province of Wigmodia (Bremen)—in Rome—Andernach. Willehad, first bishop of Bremen (787 ex. 769) . . . . .	104—113
Avares (Huns), their prince Tudun baptized. Archbishop Arno of Salzburg. Aeluin's advice to the emperor Charles and to Arno. Success of the mission. Hamburg . . .	113—115

## 2. *In Asia and Africa, 115—122.*

Limitation of the Christian church, by Chosru-Payviz of Persia—his subjugation by Heraclius . . . . .	115—116
Mohammedanism. First appearance of Mohammed. Condition of the Arabians. Mohammed's religious tone of mind. Character of his religion. One-sided view of the idea of God. Fanaticism. Absence of the ethical element. God worshipped by external works. Original state of man. Gnostic elements. Absence of the need of a redemption. Mohammed's original design—his opposition to idolatry, at a later period opposed to the Jews and the Christians. He wished to be regarded as the restorer of pure Theism, and to contend against the corruptions of earlier revelations. Opposition of the principles of Mohammedanism to Judaism. Defence of Christianity by the church-teachers, particularly in relation to the doctrines of free-will and of the deity of Christ. Causes which promoted Mohammedanism. Monophysit-	

	Page
sitism of the Copts. Melchites (note). Oppressions suffered by the Christians from the Mohammedans . . . . .	116—122
Nestorians. Timotheus, their patriarch in Syria from 778 to 820. Missionaries to India and China. Cardag and Jabdallha. Inscription relating to the labours of the Nestorian priest Olopuen in China. Christian kingdom in Nubia standing under the Coptic patriarchs . . . . .	122—124

## SECTION SECOND.

## HISTORY OF THE CHURCH CONSTITUTION, 125—168.

1. *Relation of the Church to the State.*

Appointment to church offices. Interest of the church to secure herself against the influence of the secular power. Resistance of the French monarchs. King Chilperic's doctrine of the Trinity (note). Belief in a visible Theocracy. Influence of the French monarchs in the nomination of bishops. Disregard of the ecclesiastical laws touching the <i>interstitia</i> . Bishoprics made presents of, and sold. Laws against interference with ecclesiastical elections. Deposition of Emeritus, bishop of Xaintes, and its consequences. Pains taken by Gregory the Great to remove abuses in the bestowment of benefices. Fifth synod at Paris (615) decrees free ecclesiastical elections —confirmed by Clotaire II.—Boniface. Restoration of free ecclesiastical elections by Charlemagne. Influence of the English and Spanish monarchs on the bestowment of benefices . . . . .	125—130
<i>Ecclesiastical legislation.</i> Assembling of the synods with the concurrence of the monarchs. Synods gradually fall out of use. Complaints of Gregory the Great and of Boniface on this subject. Diets pass ecclesiastical as well as civil laws. Influence of the bishops on civil legislation. In Spain, synods uphold the royal prerogative and exercise great influence over the State. Charlemagne's determination with regard to general assemblies . . . . .	130—133
Exemption of the church from State burdens. Service in war. Quarrel of the emperor Mauritius with Gregory the Great. Bondmen admitted as ecclesiastics—reason of this. Ordinances against the abuse of this. Influence of Christianity in abolishing slavery. Judgments of the church-fathers concerning this institution—Abbot Isidore of Pelusium—Johannes Eleemosynarius patriarch of Alexandria—Plato	

	Page
—Theodorus Studita—Gregory the Great. The church protects slaves. Redemption and manumission of slaves regarded as a good work . . . . .	133—139
<i>Possessions of the Church</i> —Tithes (note). Superstition contributes to their increase. Insecurity of her landed possessions. Church-bailiffs. <i>Advocati</i> . <i>Vicedomi</i> (note). Taxes on church property. Army-ban ( <i>Heerbann</i> ). Participation of bishops and abbots in war. Ordinances of Charlemagne on this subject . . . . .	139—140
<i>Administration of justice</i> —influence of the church on its judgments of the church respecting suicide (note). Alcuin opposed to the punishment of death. Intercessions of the clergy for transgressors. <i>Eparchius</i> (note). Asylums of the churches—little regard paid to them. <i>Cramnus</i> (note). Ordinances relating to the treatment of persons condemned to death in asylums—relating to the care of prisoners. Ordinances relating to the influence of the church in Spain. Benefits and evils resulting from the great influence of the bishops. Complaints of Alcuin with regard to the clergy (note) . . . . .	141—145

2. *Internal Organization of the Church*, 146—184.

Increasing consideration of the monks. Tonsure among the clergy (note). Formation of societies of ecclesiastics after the pattern of monkish fraternities. Chrodegang of Metz, founder of the canonical life of the clergy. <i>Horae Canonicae</i> . <i>Capitula</i> . Confirmation of the Rule of Chrodegang at Aix (816). Advantageous influence of this institution. Church-visitations. <i>Sends</i> in the Frank church. Abuses hurtful to the diocesan connection. Ordinationes absolute. Court. Clergy. Castle-priests. Ordinances for the maintenance of parochial worship. Rights of patronage, founded by Justinian—augmentation and abuse—laws against them. <i>Capitula Ruralia</i> among archi-presbyters. Great authority of <i>arch-deacons</i> . <i>Metropolitan constitution</i> . Disinclination of the Frank bishops to it . . . . .	146—153.
<i>Papacy</i> . Important bearing of its completion on the church theocratical system. Gregory I. the Great. His manifold activity. His conduct towards monarchs (note). His zeal for the honour of the Romish church, and habit of declining all honours shown to himself personally. His conduct towards Natalis, bishop of Salona. His recognition of the equal rank of all bishops—refuses to be called <i>Papa universalis</i> . His quarrel with the patriarch Johannes <del>inconservis</del> of Constantinople. Relation of the popes to the East-Roman emperor; to the Longobards.	

Transition of Theodelinda queen of the Longobards to the catholic church (587). Relation of the popes to the Spanish church. Reckared king of the Visigoths comes over to the catholic church (589). Leander of Seville. Gregory the Great exercises his supreme judicial authority in Spain. Queen Witiza forbids appeals to Rome (701). Dependence of the English on the Romish church. Pilgrimages. Relation of the Romish to the Frank church. Example of an acknowledged decision of pope John III. (note). Gregory the Great. Boniface. Pallium (note). Influence of the papal approbation on the anointing of Pipin. Aid furnished to pope Stephen II. by Pipin against the Longobards. Pipin adds the territory taken from the Longobards (755), to the patrimony Petri. Charlemagne founds the Frank kingdom in Italy. His coronation as emperor by pope Leo III. (800). Declarations of the popes concerning their power; Hadrian I. (note). Stephen II. demands the right of confirmation in the case of princely and royal marriages. Alcuin's view of the spiritual power of the papacy. Attempts made to create a feud between the emperor Charles and the popes. His disposition towards them. *Landed property of the church.* Forged deeds of gift by Constantine the Great. Missi. Synods at Rome touching the case of pope Leo III.; the bishops decline to pass judgment on the pope . . . . . 154—168

## SECTION THIRD.

## • CHRISTIAN LIFE AND CHRISTIAN WORSHIP, 169—193.

Christianity acquires true influence only by degrees. Foot-holds for superstition. Deficiency of continued and progressive religious instruction. Synod of Cloveshove on this subject. Determinations touching preaching in the Rule of Chrodegang. Charlemagne; Alcuin, on this subject Alcuin on the study of the Scriptures. Decrees of councils on the subject of preaching. Theodulf of Orleans active in promoting the cause of religious instruction. Great want of able clergymen. Homilia. The Homiliarum compiled by Paul the deacon with a preface of Charlemagne. The Latin, the liturgical language . . . . .

Superstition. Seeking oracles in the sacred Scriptures. Sortes sanctorum. Ordinances against these practices. Judgments of God. Introduction of them into the Burgundian code by Gundobad. Avitus of Vienne opposed to them. Charlemagne approves them. Justification sought

169—177

	Page
from external works. Charlemagne opposed to this: Theodulf of Orleans. <i>Worship of Saints</i> . Determination of this in the church system of faith. Pagan element in it. Gregory of Tours concerning Martin of Tours. Frauds practised with relics. Unworthy persons exalted to the rank of saints . . . . .	177—184
<i>Festivals</i> . <i>Presentation of Christ</i> in the Greek church. <i>Purificatio Mariæ</i> in the Western church. <i>Assumptio Mariæ</i> . Festival of Christ's circumcision. Festival of St. Michael. <i>Dies natalis apostolorum Petri et Pauli</i> . Nativity of John the Baptist. <i>Natales</i> of Sts. Andrew, Remigius, and Martin. Festival of All Saints. Alcuin on this subject . . . . .	184—185
<i>Lord's Supper</i> . Idea of sacrifice in it. Gregory the Great. Magical effects of the eucharist. <i>Ignis purgatorius</i> . Masses for the dead. <i>Missa private</i> . Voices against these . . . . .	186—188
<i>Church-discipline</i> . Private exercises of penance. <i>Absolution</i> given without permission to commune. <i>Libelli penitentiales</i> . Directions for the administration of church penance. <i>Fee</i> culary mulcts. Compositions. <i>Origin of indulgence</i> . Mischiefs growing out of it. Synodal declaration touching the giving of alms and other external works, touching the divine forgiveness of sin and priestly <i>absolution</i> . Theodulf of Orleans, Halitgar of Cambray on these points. More rigid forms of penance . . . . .	188—193

## SECTION FOURTH.

### HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY APPREHENDED AND DEVELOPED AS A SYSTEM OF DOCTRINES, 194—372.

#### 1. In the Latin Church, 194—223.

<i>Gregory the Great</i> . Circumstances of his life. Improves the psalmody and liturgy of the church: a zealous preacher; his <i>Regula pastoralis</i> . Influence of Augustin on him. His doctrine of predestination. Practical application of it. Uncertainty respecting salvation. Injurious consequences of this doctrine. Opposition of the purely Christian and sensuous catholic elements. His views of miracles; of prayer. His mode of treating ethics. His <i>Moralia</i> . His views of love; the cardinal virtues. Opposed to mere <i>opus operatum</i> . His views of the new creation. Of mock-humility and truthfulness. His views of the relation of <i>ratio</i> to <i>fides</i> . Of the study of profane literature. The commentary on the two books of Kings ascribed to him on this point (note) . . . . .	194—209
Decline of ancient culture. Libraries. Cassiodore (note) . . . . .	208

## CONTENTS OF VOL. V.

xvii

	Page
<i>Isidore of Hispania.</i> His writings. His models. His influence . . . . .	209
<i>Theological culture in Ireland.</i> Archbishop Theodore of Canterbury. Abbot Hadrian (Adrian). Their laudable efforts in founding schools. The venerable <i>Bede</i> (A.D. 673—735). Egbert, archbishop of York. Elbert, master of the school at York. <i>Alcuin</i> (A.D. 735—804). Events of his life. Charlemagne's zeal for the advancement of the sciences. Alcuin master of the Scola Palatina. His intimate relations with Charlemagne—he improves the Latin version of the Bible—becomes teacher to the abbey of St. Martin of Tours—his end . . . . .	209—215
<i>Dogmatical oppositions of this age.</i> In the Carolingian period the application of traditional dogmas prevailed over new investigations concerning the doctrines of faith. Renewal of the opposition between the Antiochian and the Alexandrian schools in Spain. <i>Elipandus</i> , archbishop of Toledo. His personal character. His controversies with the errorist <i>Migetius</i> (note). <i>Felix</i> of Urgellis, probably the author of <i>Adoptionism</i> . Resemblance of the mode of development of his dogmatical views with that of Theodore of Mopsuestia. Whether <i>Felix</i> was instigated by the writings of <i>Theodore</i> ? Possibility of the spread of these writings in Spain. <i>Felix</i> defends Christianity against Mohammedanism. Combats the confounding together of the predicates of the two natures in Christ. In what sense Christ is called Son of God and God. The antithesis between <i>natura</i> , <i>genere</i> and <i>voluntate</i> , <i>beneplacito</i> . Antithesis between a <i>filius genere et natura</i> , and a <i>filius adoptione</i> . Idea of adoption. His appeal to Scripture. Hypothesis of the ἀντιμεθώπεια τῶν ὄντων (note). Comparison of the union between God and Christ with the adoption of men by grace. <i>Felix</i> opposed to the designation of Mary as the mother of God. Connection of baptism with the spiritualis generatio per adoptionem. Progressive steps of the revelation of God in the humanity of Christ. <i>Agnosticism</i> . . . . .	215—225
<i>Opponents of Adoptionism.</i> <i>Etherius</i> of Othma. <i>Beatus</i> . Violence of the dispute. Conduct of <i>Elipandus</i> . Spread of the Controversy to France. Character of <i>Felix</i> of Urgellis. Condemnation of Adoptionism at Regensburg (A.D. 792). <i>Felix</i> in Rome—his recantation. <i>Felix</i> in Spain. Letter to the Spanish bishops. Council at Frankfurt (A.D. 794). <i>Alcuin</i> . <i>Felix</i> defends Adoptionism against <i>Alcuin</i> . His more liberal views concerning the church. Letter of <i>Elipandus</i> to <i>Alcuin</i> . <i>Elipandus</i> on the Romish church (note). Pope Adrian on the apostol. Decret. Act 15 (note). Proposal of <i>Alcuin</i> for the refutation of <i>Felix</i> . Abbot Benedict of Aniana, archbishop Leidrad of Lyons and bishop Nefrid of Narbonne are sent	

	Page
to south-France for the purpose of suppressing Adoptionism. Their meeting with Felix of Urgell's. Felix before the synod at Aix (A.D. 799) declares himself convinced—is committed to the oversight of Leidrad of Lyons. Felix (ex. 816) retains his opinions. His avowal respecting Agnoetism . . . . .	225—233
 2. <i>In the Greek Church</i> , 233—335.	
<i>State of learning</i> . Free mental development placed under check. Collections of the scriptural expositions of the older church-teachers, <i>catenæ</i> , συγκαί. Predominant dialectical tendency. John of Damascus. A dialectico-mystical tendency fostered by Monachism. Spurious writings of Dionysius the Areopagite—first used (A.D. 538) by the Severianians. Presbyter Theodore defends their genuineness. Influence of these writings. Distinction of a θεολογία καταφατική and ἀποφατική . . . . .	233—237
<i>Maximus</i> , representative of the dialectico-contemplative tendency. Character of his writings. On servitude. End of creation. End of redemption. Continuous incarnation of the Logos in the faithful. Natural ability and grace. This belonging together of the divine and human in the faithful, compared with the two natures in Christ. Progressive evolution of divine revelations. Faith—faith compared with the kingdom of God. Love. Union of the theoretical and the practical. Prayer. Everlasting life and earthly existence. Restoration . . . . .	237—242
<i>Monothelite controversies</i> . Internal and external causes of them. Emperor Heraclius proposes a formulary of union. Cyrus, bishop of Phasis, after 630, patriarch of Alexandria, hesitates about adopting the formulary of union. Judgment of Sergius patriarch of Constantinople respecting it. Covenant of Cyrus with the Egyptian Monophysites. Sophronius, opposes the covenant. Sergius endeavours to suppress the dispute. His inclination to Monothelitism. Sophronius, after 634, patriarch of Jerusalem. Honorius of Rome declares in favour of Monotheletism, without wishing for ecclesiastical determinations; his judgment respecting the controversy. Circular letter of Sophronius, expressing Dyothelitism. Edict of Heraclius: Στάτιον τῆς Σεργίου (A.D. 638) favouring Monotheletism—confirmed by a σύνοδος ἴνδρυμένου at Constantinople. Maximus, head of the Dyothelite party. Theodore, bishop of Pharan, head of the Monothelete party. Dogmatical interest of the latter. Positions maintained by Maximus against him. Approximation of Monotheletism to Doctetism (note). The Monotheletes hold to an absorption of the human will in the divine. Maximus against this. Difference of interpretation of the older church-teachers. . . . .	242—254

	Page
<i>Dyothletism</i> , predominant in Rome and Africa. Maximus active as a writer. Gregorius, governor in Africa. Pyrrhus, patriarch of Constantinople, resigns his office (A.D. 642)—disputes with Maximus—passes over for a time to the Dyothletians. Edict of the emperor <i>Constans</i> : τίτλος τῆς τοπείας (648). <i>Paulus</i> , patriarch of Constantinople. Content of the τίτλος. Issue of it . . . . .	254—256
<i>Martin I.</i> , pope, zealous Dyothletist. Assemblies (A.D. 648) the general Lateran council. This condemns Monotheletism and the edict. <i>Olympius</i> , Exarch of Ravenna. <i>Calliopas</i> his successor (A.D. 653). Martin considered a state criminal. Defends himself. Political charges laid against him. Conduct of Calliopas. Martin deposed, taken prisoner—suffers with submission—is tried at Constantinople—banished to Chersonesus—dies, forsaken by his friends . . . . .	256—264
<i>Maximus</i> taken prisoner with <i>Anastasius</i> . Political charges. At first treated with lenity. Attempts to induce Maximus to yield. New formulary of union. <i>Eugenius</i> , bishop of Rome. Banishment of Maximus. His death occasioned by cruel treatment . . . . .	264—266
<i>Opposition of the Romish and Greek Churches</i> . <i>Eugenius</i> and <i>Vitalian</i> of Rome. Breaking out of the opposition from the time of <i>Adeodatus</i> of Rome (A.D. 677). <i>Theodore</i> , patriarch of Constantinople; <i>Macarius</i> , patriarch of Antioch. Emperor <i>Constantine Pogonatus</i> . His letter to <i>Domnus</i> of Rome (678) . . . . .	266—267
<i>Sixth general council, the third at Constantinople the first Trullan</i> . Vagueness of the language of the older church teachers on the disputed points. Two letters of bishop <i>Agatho</i> of Rome to the council expressing Dyothletism. <i>Georgius</i> , patriarch of Constantinople, declares himself convinced by them. <i>Macarius</i> adheres to Monotheletism. <i>Polychrōtus</i> . Establishment of Dyothletism in a creed. The Monotheletian patriarchs of Constantinople and <i>Honorius</i> of Rome anathematized . . . . .	267—270
<i>Second Trullan council</i> (conc. quini-sextum) under <i>Justinian II.</i> . . . . .	270
<i>Brief rule of Monotheletism</i> by means of the emperor <i>Philippicus</i> . <i>John</i> , patriarch of Constantinople. Synod at Constantinople draw up a symbol for Monotheletism. Insurrection in Italy . . . . .	270—272
<i>Victory of Dyothletism</i> by means of the emperor <i>Anastasius II.</i> Change of opinions by the patriarch <i>John</i> —his letter to <i>Constantine</i> of Rome. <i>John</i> of Damascus propagates the disputes against Monotheletism . . . . .	272
<i>Monotheletism of the Maronites</i> . . . . .	272
<i>Controversies respecting image-worship</i> —general participation in them. <i>Theodorus Studita</i> on the difference between these and earlier disputes. History of the mode of thinking and	

	Page
acting in relation to this matter. <i>Gregory the Great</i> on image-worship—his affair with Serenus of Marseilles. Zeal for image-worship among the later popes. Superstitious worship of images in the <i>Greek</i> church. <i>Ἀχιροτίνη</i> . Reaction against this proceeding, especially from secular power. Mischiefs of this . . . . .	273—279
Emperor Leo the Isaurian. Forceable measures against <i>Iconoclasts</i> and <i>Montanists</i> —result of these. Individual bishop by means of study led to oppose image-worship. Constantine of Nacolia. Motives and proceedings of Leo. <i>Germanus</i> , patriarch of Constantinople, friend of image-worship. Ordinance of Leo (A.D. 726) against signs of a superstitious worship of images. Interview between Leo and Germanus. Reasons of Germanus in favour of image-worship. Individual bishops act against images. Disturbances among the people. Constantine at Nacolia treats with Germanus at Constantinople. Thomas of Claudiopolis operates against image-worship. Letter of Germanus to him. Excitement produced by this attack on image-worship. <i>John of Damascus</i> —his education (note)—combats the tales of dragons and fairies (note)—writes a discourse in defence of image-worship. Insurrection in the Cyclades island under Stephen. Prohibition of all religious images (730). Germanus resigns his office. Anastasius his successor. The recusant bishops deposed. Second and third discourses of John in defence of images. Dissolution of church-fellowship between the two parties. Letter of Gregory II to the emperor. Difficulty of carrying the edict into full effect. Abolition of the most important images. Disturbances attending it. The image <i>Χριστός ὁ ἀντιμέντος</i> (note)—προσκύνης to the cross . . . . .	279—295
Empero: Constantine <i>Cyprianius</i> (A.D. 741). Insurrection of <i>Artabasdes</i> . Restoration of image-worship. Constantine becomes (A.D. 741) once more master of the empire. General council (A.D. 754) at Constantinople. <i>Theodosius</i> of Ephesus. Abolition of images of Christ, the Virgin Mary, and the saints. Causes of this. Decrees against images of every sort; against the art of painting; against arbitrary use of church utensils. Confession of faith. Polemical attack of images in the doctrines concerning the person of Christ. Opposite modes of view which prevailed among the image-worshippers and the iconoclasts. Anathemas pronounced on such as made images of Christ and the saints—on such as did not worship Mary and the saints. Accusations brought against the iconoclasts, that they injured the worship of Mary and of the saints. Reports concerning the emperor Constantine on this in the <i>Constantine of Syleum</i> becomes patriarch of Constantinople. Execution of the decrees of	

	Page
the council. Burning of books on account of the pictures in them (note). Images secretly preserved. Resistance made by the monks to the decree. <i>Stephen</i> . Cruel proceedings against the monks. Andrew the Calybite. Description of the bishops of this period. Emperor Constantine, enemy of monachism, of relics—his opposition to the devotional classes generally—opposed to the title <i>Στορόνες</i> bestowed on Mary. The patriarch Constantine deposed and executed. Result of the efforts of Constantine the emperor . . . . .	295—308
Emperor Leo IV. His wife <i>Irene</i> —her religious disposition and love for images—her oath not to worship images. Leo's character. New influence of the monks—result of it. Attempt to reintroduce image-worship. Leo's proceedings against—his death . . . . .	308—310
Irene reigns in place of Constantine yet a minor. Obstacles to the immediate restoration of the images. Favour shown to monachism. Reverence of the empress for the monks. Paul patriarch of Constantinople abdicates—possible motives which may have induced him. <i>Tararius</i> , the emperor's secretary, proposed by Paul as his successor—struggles against receiving the patriarchate—presents his reasons before the people, and makes conditions in favour of image-worship. Arrangement for a general council. Correspondence for this purpose with pope Adrian I. Difficulty of bringing about the concurrence of all the four patriarchs. The monks John and Thomas representatives of the three failing patriarchs. Theodosius Studita on this council (note). Opening of the council (A.D. 786) at Constantinople. Many iconoclasts among the bishops. Heads of the iconoclasts (note). The army, particularly the body-guard, opposed to images. Secret transactions of the iconoclasts—their meetings forbidden by Tararius. Opposition of the iconoclasts to the council. Insurrection of the body-guard. Prevention of the council. Body-guard dissolved—a new one formed. <i>The general council</i> (A.D. 787) called to meet at Nicea. Testimonies are cited in favour of images from the church-fathers, and from the histories of saints. Sudden change of opinion in many of the iconoclasts. Careless mode of proceeding towards the recanting bishops. The monks opposed to it. Indications of a protestant tendency of spirit among the iconoclasts. Decrees of the council with regard to images. The assembly repair to Constantinople. Eighth session held there in presence of the empress and her son. Promulgation of the decrees. Reaction against this triumph of image-worship necessary . . . . .	310—322
<i>Participation of the Western church in these controversies.</i> Worship of images predominant in the Romish church. Opposition to it in the <i>Frank</i> church—whether an ori-	

ginal one, or first called forth in the Carolingian age? Transactions concerning images at Gentiliacum (A.D. 767) under Pipin—the result unknown. Judgment of pope Paul I. with regard to these transactions—conclusions to be drawn therefrom in respect to image-worship. Participation of the Frank church in the image-controversy under Charlemagne. *Charlemagne* opponent of the second Nicene council—for what reasons? Refutation of the council in the *Libri Carolinis*. Their author. The *Libri Carolini* opposed to the destruction of images, and to the superstition-worship of them. Judgment respecting the end and use of images. Opposition between the standing points of the Old and New Testaments brought prominently to view. Judgment respecting the sacred Scriptures; respecting the sign of the cross; respecting tapers; respecting the use of lights and incense. Prominence given to the fulfilment of Christian duties over image-worship. Rejection of learned decisions respecting image-worship. Declarations concerning the miracles said to be wrought by means of images; concerning the confirmation of image-worship given in dreams; concerning the worship of saints against the Byzantine Basilei-  
city against the guiding of a council by a woman. The emperor sends this written refutation to pope Adrian. Reply of the pope. Decree of the council of Frankfort (A.D. 794) against the service of images . . . . . 322—335

3. *Re-action of the sects against the dominant system of doctrine;*  
336—372.

Remains of the more ancient sects in the East, opposed to the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, but also particularly to the corruption of it by the introduction of the Jewish element . . . . . 336—337

*The Paulicians*—whether they sprang out of Manicheanism? *Callinice* and his sons *Paul* and *John*. Points of opposition between the Paulicians and the Manicheans. Agreement of the Paulicians with the Marcionite sects—possibility of their correction. Examination of the story about Callinice and his sons. Origin of the name of the Paulicians. Constantine (Silvanus) founder of the sect. Attachment of the Paulicians to the New Testament, particularly to the writings of Paul. Persecution of them under Constantine Pogonatus. Simeon sent to institute inquiries against them 684. Constantine stoned. Simeon becomes inclined to the principles of the Paulicians—finally becomes head of the sect and assumes the name of Titus. New persecution under Justinian II (690). Simeon executed. Paul & Simeon among the Paulicians by means of *Geguasius* and *the Lyons*. *Geguasius* tried at Con-

stantinople, and declared orthodox in the faith. The Paulicians opposed to image-worship; whether Leo the Isaurian was for this reason favourable to them? John of Oznum (note). New schism among the Paulicians by means of <i>Zacharias</i> and <i>Joseph</i> . Spread of the Paulicians to Asia Minor. <i>Baanes ἡ ἐπαρχία</i> . Sergius (Tychicus), reformer of the sect—result of his labours—his self-exaltation. False accusation brought against Sergius and the Paulicians by their adversaries. Whether Sergius styled himself the Paraclete? Emperor Nicephorus against the Paulicians—cause of this. A party in the Greek church disapproves of the bloody persecution of heretics. Theodorus Studita, its representative. Persecution of the Paulicians under the emperor Michael Curopalates and Leo the Armenian. Conspiracy of the Paulicians. <i>Κυροχωρίται, Αργασοῦται</i> . Irruptions of the Paulicians in Roman provinces. Sergius opposed to this—his assassination . . . . .	337—354
<i>Doctrine of the Paulicians</i> . Dualistic principles—whether they attributed the creation of the world to the evil principle?—Demiurge and perfect God. Different views of the creation of heaven. The corporeal world, a work of the Demiurge. Constituent parts of human nature. The anthropogony and anthropology of the Paulicians. Fragment of a letter of Sergius—sense of the word <i>πονητική</i> in it. Original affinity of the soul with God—enduring union of the same with God. Meaning of the doctrine of redemption. Person and work of the Redeemer. Doctrine concerning Christ's body. Monophysitism in the Armenian church—different ways of apprehending the same. Point of attachment presented to the Paulicians in the ultra-monophysite forms of expression. Opposition to the worship of Mary. Christ's passion. Symbolical meaning of the crucifixion. Opposition to the adoration of the cross. Simplification of religious Acts. Rejection of the celebration of the sacraments. They style themselves the Catholic church, <i>Χριστοπολῖται</i> . Apostolic simplicity in ecclesiastical institutions. <i>Προστιχαῖ</i> . Opposition to priesthood. Church offices. Apostles and prophets; <i>πομπῖνοι</i> and <i>διάσκολοι</i> ; <i>συνέκδημοι</i> ; <i>νοτάροι</i> . Successors of Sergius in the guidance of the sect. <i>Ἄστρατοι</i> . Moral system of the Paulicians. Allegations of their opponents with regard to the hindrances to marriage. Serious moral spirit of the Paulician doctrines. Opposition to the ascetic prescriptions in the Greek church. View of the Old Testament. <i>Προσκύνητος</i> before the books of the gospels. Special use of the gospels of Luke and John. Rejection of the epistles of Peter . . . . .	354—371
<i>Other anti-hierarchical sects. Αθιγγανοί</i> . . . . .	371—372

## FOURTH PERIOD OF THE HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

FROM THE DEATH OF CHARLEMAGNE TO POPE GREGORY VII.,  
OR FROM A.D. 814 TO A.D. 1073.

### SECTION FIRST.

EXTENSION AND LIMITATION OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, 373—477.

	Page
<i>Denmark and Sweden.</i> Disputes concerning the succession in Denmark lead prince Harald Krag of Jutland to apply to Lewis the Pious for assistance (A.D. 822). Lewis takes advantage of this opportunity to found a mission, <i>of Ebbo</i> of Rheims and Halitgar of Cambray, missionaries. Harald baptized (A.D. 826). Anschar from the monastery of Corvey sent by Lewis to Denmark (A.D. 826). His labours restricted by Harald's expulsion. Anschar goes (in 829) to Sweden, labours to introduce Christianity, returns (in 831) to the Frank empire, Lewis makes Hamburg a centre for the northern missions. <i>Anschar, Ebbo, Gauzbert</i> appointed by pope Leo IV. to diffuse Christianity in the North . . . . . 371—381	
In Denmark king Horik a hindrance to the spread of Christianity. Anschar not discouraged. Gauzbert labours in Sweden with good success. Hamburg laid waste by the Normans. Death of Lewis the Pious. Bremen united with Hamburg. Anschar takes advantage of the personal friendship of king Horik (Erich) of Jutland to spread Christianity in Denmark. Ardgar labours in Sweden. Herigar converts the calamities which beset Sweden into a means of advancing Christianity among the people, Pious Christians in Sweden. Ardgar returns home. Anschar goes with Erimbert to Sweden. Meets with an unfavourable reception. Succeeds in persuading the king to embrace Christianity. Anschar returns (in 854). Horik II., an enemy of Christianity. Anschar's humility, sickness, and death . . . . . 381—395	
Rimbert, Anschar's disciple, labours in Denmark and Sweden. King Germ in Denmark (934) hostile to Christianity. Compelled by Henry I. of Germany to desist from perse-	

cuting Christianity. Archbishop Unni goes to Denmark. Favourably received by the king's son, *Harald Blaftind* (911). War between the latter and Otho I. (972) favourable to the introduction of Christianity. Harald receives baptism. • Sveno, Harald's son, opposed to his father, and to Christianity (991). *Canute the Great* (1014) zealous in favour of Christianity. Undertakes (1027) a pilgrimage to Rome. Records his sentiments in favour of Christianity in a letter to his people . . . . .

395—400

*Sweden*. Labour of Rimbert and of Unni. Its union with Denmark favourable to the cause of Christianity. The Swedish king, Olof Stenkonnung, declares himself at first decided in favour of Christianity. English ecclesiastics accomplish nothing by their imprudent zeal. Jacob Amund and his step-brother Emund (1051) promote Christianity. Stenkil his successor (1059) active in behalf of Christianity. The cure of an idolatrous priest tends to advance Christianity. Opinion expressed by Adam of Bremen respecting the preparation of Sweden for receiving Christianity . . . . .

400—403

*Norway*. The Normans become acquainted with Christianity by means of their piratical expeditions against Christian nations. Prince Hacon endeavours to found the Christian church in Norway. Transfers the Yule festival of his people to Christmas. Proposes to his people (945) that they should renounce idolatry. Meets with violent opposition and is forced to conform to the usages of his country. The Danish king Harald endeavours (967) to destroy paganism in Norway by force. His vicegerent *Yarl Hacon* restores idolatry. The Norwegian general *Olof Tryggweson* becomes acquainted with Christianity through his intercourse with Christian nations. Receives baptism in England, obtains the government in Norway. Introduces Christianity by force (1000). Under the foreign regents, who divided Norway among them, paganism revives. *Olof the Thick* (1017) a decided Christian. Proceeds with great violence against paganism. Scarcity in some provinces causes the restoration of the pagan rites, which Olof abolishes by force. Insurrection against Olof under *Gulbrand*. Olof demolishes the great Thor (an enormous idol). Is killed in a battle against Canute king of Denmark and England (1033). Honoured as a martyr

402—412

*Iceland*. First attempt to introduce Christianity there. *Thorwald*, a respectable Icelander, carries bishop Frederic of Saxony to Iceland (981). Thorwald meets with an indifferent reception. Traverses the country amid many persecutions. Goes to Norway (986). Olof Tryggweson induces the Icelander Stefner to preach Christianity in his native land. Obliged to leave his country (997), and to return again to king Olof. A like fate befalls the Icelander.

	Page
lander Hialhti. Thangbrand (997) sent as an envoy to Iceland by king Olof. Obliged to flee on account of a murder (999). Gissur and Hialhti go as missionaries to Iceland (1000). Are received. Sidu-Hallr, leader of the Christians. Laws passed in favour of Christianity. Recognition of Christianity as the public religion. <i>Leif</i> , the first Icelandic bishop . . . . .	412—420
<i>The Orcades and Faroe Islands.</i> Olof Tryggweson induces one of the most powerful of the Faroe-islanders, Sigmund Bresteron, to receive baptism (998). He proposed to the islanders that they should receive Christianity. Meets with violent opposition. Yet labours on zealously. <i>Thrand</i> , a powerful islander, with his followers, returns back to paganism . . . . .	420—421
<i>Greenland.</i> The Icelander Leif conveys (999) Christianity to Greenland. Adalbert (1055) bishop of the Greenlanders. Ion, said to have met with martyrdom in Greenland (A.D. 1059) . . . . .	422
<i>Bulgaria.</i> Christians who had been taken prisoners by the Bulgarians (813), diffuse Christianity in Bulgaria. Constantius Cypharas, a captive monk. Bogoris, prince of the Bulgarians, converted by his sister Theodora and by the monk Methodius (864). Photius, patriarch of Constantinople, exhorts him in a letter to take measures for the conversion of his people. False teachers among the Bulgarians. Pope Nicholas I. lays down rules for the Bulgarians respecting the keeping of festivals, against superstition, against cruelty, against the too frequent capital punishments, against the employment of the rack, respecting freedom and despotism. The Greek emperor, Basilus Macedo, prevails upon the Bulgarians to adopt the Greek church. . . . .	422—432
<i>Crimea</i> Cyril and Methodius, meritorious efforts of, to convert the Chazars inhabiting this peninsula. . . . .	433
<i>Moravia.</i> Radislav, ruler of the Moravians, connects himself from motives of policy first with the Greek, afterwards with the German empire. Cyril and Methodius labour earnestly for Christianity. Methodius, archbishop of the Moravian church, excites the jealousy of the German clergy. Is complained of to pope John VII. Is summoned to Rome, where he satisfies the pope (879). John VIII. recommends Methodius in a letter to Swatopluk, successor to Radislav. Methodius falls out with Radislav. Bishop Wichin takes part against him, and he is defeated (881) . . . . .	434—442
<i>Bohemia.</i> Duke <i>Borivoj</i> of Bohemia becomes acquainted with Christianity at the Moravian court. His son <i>Wratislav</i> leaves behind him (A.D. 925) two sons, <i>Wenceslav</i> and <i>Boleslav</i> . Wenceslav, a zealous Christian, is assassinated by his pagan brother Boleslav (938). Boleslav	

	Page
professes Christianity. His son, Boleslav the mild, a zealous Christian. Adalbert, archbishop of Prague, labours in Bohemia. Severus, archbishop of Prague (1038), makes laws for the church	442—444
<i>Kingdom of the Wends.</i> Boso, bishop of Merseburg, labours first among the Slavonians. Insurrection of the Wends. Otho I. avails himself of his victory over the Slavonian tribes to found several bishoprics. <i>Mistiwoi</i> , a Wendian prince, destroys all the Christian establishments in northern Germany (983). Repents and returns back to Christianity. Gottshalk, founder of the kingdom of the Wends (1047), a zealous Christian. Founds many bishoprics. New insurrection of the Wends. Gottshalk d. (1066) by martyrdom	444—449
<i>Russia.</i> Commercial connections and wars with the Greek empire the means of spreading Christianity among the Russians. Under the grand prince Igur (945) there are already Christians in the Russian army. Kiew, the most important place for the diffusion of Christianity. The grand princess Olga embraces Christianity. Her son Swaroslaw is not to be won to Christianity. Confounding of the Russi with the Rugi (note). <i>Vladimir</i> , uncle of the grand princess Olga, embraces Christianity. He and his successor Jaroslaw (1019—1054) promote Christianity. Introduction of Cyril's alphabet and his translation of the Bible	450—454
<i>Poland.</i> The Christian church planted there from Bohemia. Duke Mieczlaw and his Bohemian wife Dambrowska receive baptism (966)	454
<i>Hungary.</i> Its connection with the Greek empire the first occasion of missionary enterprises there. <i>Bulosudes</i> and <i>Gylas</i> , two Hungarian princes, are said to have been baptized at Constantinople towards the middle of the tenth century. Beginning of the missions (970). <i>Pilgrim of Passau</i> sends the monk Wolfgang to Hungary as a missionary. <i>Adalbert</i> of Prague and his disciple Radla labour in Hungary. Stephen, son and successor of the Hungarian prince Geisa, labour zealously to spread Christianity (997). Calls monks and ecclesiastics into his kingdom. Has recourse to violent measures for the introduction of Christianity. Emmerich, his son and successor. Stephen honoured as a saint. Reaction of the pagan party	454—461
<i>Limitation of the Christian Church in Spain.</i> Until the year 850 Christians allowed the free exercise of their religion. Insults and persecution of the Christians. The more lax and the more strict party of Christians. Paul Alvarus of Cordova. Fanatical enthusiasm for martyrdom among the Christians. Abderrhamen II., caliph of the Arabians (850). Perfectus (850), John, Isaac, Flora, die	

	Page
as martyrs. Eulogius and Alvarus promote the fanaticism. Recasfrid comes out against it. Aurelius and other martyrs. Council of Cordova against these disturbances (852). Mohammed, successor of Abderrhaman. Eulogius dies a martyr. Apologeticus martyrum of Eulogius and Indiculus luminosus of Alvarus. Prudent party of the Christians repress the fanaticism . . . .	461—475

# CHURCH HISTORY.

THIRD PERIOD OF THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH. FROM  
THE TIME OF GREGORY THE GREAT, BISHOP OF ROME,  
• TO THE DEATH OF THE EMPEROR CHARLEMAGNE ;  
OR FROM THE YEAR 590 TO THE YEAR 814.

## INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

THIS period opens to us a new theatre for the exhibition of the power of the gospel to mould and transform the world ; and we shall see it revealing itself in a new and peculiar way. For, in the earlier periods, we saw Christianity attaching itself to the culture of the ancient world, then existing under the forms of the Greek and Roman peculiarities of national character ; and where the harmonious culture that could be derived from the elements of human nature left to itself had reached its highest point, and degenerating into false refinement wrought its own destruction, we saw Christianity introducing a new element of *divine* life, whereby the race, already sinking in spiritual death, was requickened and raised to a far higher point of spiritual development than had been reached before ; a new creation springing forth out of the new spirit in the ancient form. But a race of people now appear, who are still in the rudeness of barbarism ; and on these Christianity bestows, by imparting to them the seed of a divine life, the germ of all human culture ;—not as an outward possession already complete and prepared for their acceptance, but as something which was to unfold itself with entire freshness and originality from within, through the inward impulse of a divine life, and in conformity with the individuality of character belonging to this particular race of men.

It is the distinguishing characteristic of this new work of Christianity, that the new creation does not attach itself to any previously existing form of culture sprung from some entirely different root; but that everything here springs from the root, and grows out of the vital sap of Christianity itself. We come to the fountain head, whence flow'd the whole peculiar character of the middle ages and all modern civilization.

It is true, the form in which these rude tribes first came to the knowledge of Christianity was not that of the pure gospel. It was the form of church tradition, handed down from the earlier centuries; in which, as we have seen in tracing the earlier course of development, the divine word had become mixed up with many foreign elements. ~~but~~ still, even through the wood, hay and stubble of mere human modes of apprehension, the one and only foundation, which ~~ever~~ stood firm, though concealed under the load of foreign additions—the foundation of faith in the redeeming love of God, revealed through, and in Christ, as the Redeemer of sinful man—was able to manifest its divine power to transform, to train, and to refine mankind; and with the implantation of this one principle in humanity was given also the element from which would proceed of its own accord, the reaction against ~~the~~ foreign admixtures. Such a reaction we may trace ~~as~~ through the whole development of the church tradition in the middle ages; and while, on the one hand, those foreign elements were ever assuming a more substantial shape, so on the other, this reaction of the original Christian consciousness, that strove to purge away every foreign element was ~~constantly~~ gaining new strength, till it acquired power enough to introduce into the church a thorough process of purification. Nor should we fail to notice, that with this tradition there was handed down, in the sacred text itself, a source of divine knowledge not exposed, in like manner, to corruption, from which the church might learn how to distinguish primitive Christianity from all subsequent additions, and so carry forward the work of purifying the Christian consciousness to its entire completion.

The above mentioned intermixture of Christianity with foreign elements may be properly traced to such causes as the following: that the idea of the kingdom of God had been

degraded from man's spirit and inward being, and made sensuous and outward ; that in place of the progressive, inward, and spiritual union of the soul with the kingdom of God through faith, had been substituted a progressive, outward mediation with it by means of certain forms and ceremonies ; and that in place of the universal, spiritual priesthood of Christians, had been substituted a special outward priesthood as the only medium of union betwixt man and God's kingdom ; so that the idea of this kingdom was gradually reduced to the form of the Old Testament theocracy. The church of Christ having thus taken the shape of an outward, visible theocracy, it followed, as a general consequence, that in a multitude of ways, the different Jewish and Christian points of view were confounded together. But this Old Testament form, adopted by the church, proved to the rude tribes, who were not yet prepared to take the gospel into their life in its pure spirituality, an intermediate stage, for training them to the maturity of Christian manhood, which they were destined to attain as soon as they were ready for it, by means of that reaction, the elements of which already existed in the Christian consciousness.

The new creation of Christianity which we have now to contemplate, proceeded from those barbarous tribes, particularly of German origin, who planted themselves on the ruins of the Roman empire which they had destroyed, and formed in the West the new theatre of a historical development, which was to shape the destinies of the world. The way in which Christianity was first conveyed to them is a point deserving of special consideration in order to a right understanding of the whole of this new period of church history ; and every thing relating to this subject, which in the order of time would have belonged to the earlier centuries, but which we have thus far passed over as unconnected with the progress of Christianity in the old Grecian and Roman world, we shall here embrace together under one view.

## SECTION FIRST.

RELATION OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH TO THE WORLD ;  
ITS EXTENSION AND LIMITATION.

## I. IN EUROPE.

SEVERAL tribes of German origin, which, during the migration of nations in the fourth and fifth centuries, settled down in Gaul, were there gained over to Christianity, simply by coming in contact with the Christian inhabitants. Pious bishops and abbots, such, for instance, in the fifth and sixth centuries, as Avitus of Vienne, Faustus of Rhegii (Riez), Cæsarius of Atles,\* exemplified in these countries, by lives of unwearied, active, and self-denying love, the blessed influence of the Christian faith in the midst of havoc and desolation ; and while, by such lives, they inspired respect and confidence

\* Cæsarius was distinguished for his zeal in promoting both the spiritual and temporal welfare of the tribes among whom he lived : for his efforts to communicate religious instruction to the people in a manner suited to their wants by the public preaching of the gospel, and by private intercourse with them, and for his earnest endeavours to ameliorate their temporal condition and to redeem captives who had been reduced to slavery. He sold the vessels and other property of the church, even down to his own priestly robes, to furnish himself with the means for bestowing charity. The presents which he received from princes, he immediately converted into money, that he might have wherewith to succour the needy. Amid the most difficult relations incident to the change of governments under the conquests of different tribes, Burgundians, East Goths, West Goths, Franks, and under the reigns of Arian monarchs, whose suspicions he would be likely to excite by the difference of his creed, he was enabled by a purity of life which commanded respect, by the wisdom with which he accommodated himself to men of different dispositions, and by a charity which was extended to all without distinction, to preserve his influence unimpaired. Though subjected to persecutions, on the ground of political suspicion, yet his innocence brought him out victorious over them all ; which caused him to be regarded with still greater reverence than before. See the accounts of his life by his disciples in the *Actis sanctorum mens.* August. I. VI. His scattered sermons (a complete critical edition of which still remains a desideratum) prove also the activity of his life.

in the leaders of those barbarous hordes, as well as trust and love in the people themselves, they contributed in no small measure to introduce and extend the gospel among them. By marriage alliances, the seeds of Christianity were, in the next place, easily transplanted from one of these tribes to another. Thus the Burgundians,\* near the beginning of the fifth century, and soon after their settlement in Gaul, were, in some way which cannot now be exactly determined, converted to Christianity. If they did not, from the very first, receive their instruction in Christianity from Arian teachers,† yet by their intercourse with the Arian tribes settled in these districts, particularly the West Goths, they were led at some later period to embrace Arian doctrines;‡ and it was only in the

\* Orosius, in his History of the World (Hist. 8, 32), already speaks of them as Christians, and notices the change which Christianity had produced in the habits of the people. The account given of them by Socrates (7, 30), who was so far removed from the scene of events, though founded no doubt in some measure, on facts, is still too inaccurate to be relied on.

† That they may have done so, is at least a very possible supposition. The truth is, we know little or nothing distinctly about the beginning of their conversion; but their later steadfastness in maintaining the Arian doctrines would admit in this way of being more easily explained.

‡ The Arians, having been expelled from the Roman empire, were on this account the more zealous in propagating their doctrines among the tribes who had not as yet embraced Christianity, or who were not firmly established in the Christian faith. We have seen already why it was, that the Anti-Nicene doctrine proved particularly acceptable to the untutored nations. It would certainly be wrong to pronounce an indiscriminate sentence of condemnation on all these Arian missionaries and ecclesiastics. • Judging from what may be known of them, from the life and writings of Fulgentius, bishop of Ruspe, and from the history of the persecution among the Vandals, we must conceive of them as being in part rude zealots, who thought more of spreading Arianism than the gospel; and Maximus, bishop of Turin, warns the people against certain vagabond, probably Arian, priests, who made it an easy matter to become a Christian, and of whom he says, that they led away the people by fallacibus blandimentis, that, taking advantage of the custom which prevailed among the German tribes of paying compensation money (Geldbussen compositiones) for all crimes, they had their prices for the absolution of sins, *ut si quis laicorum fassus fuerit crimen admis- sum, non dicat ille: age poenitentiam, sed dicat: pro hoc crimine da tantum mihi et indulgetur tibi.* Hom. 10. in Mabillon Museum Italicum T. I. P. II. page 28. But there is nothing to warrant the opinion that such was the character of the Arian clergy generally. The condition of the Burgundian people speaks rather in their favour than against them.

reign of Gundobad, who stood in intimate and friendly relations with that zealous defender of the Catholic faith, Avitus, bishop of Vienne, who frequently consulted him on matters of religious doctrine, and in the year 499 brought about a conference between him and the Arian clergy,\* that the way was opened for the Burgundian chiefs to embrace the Niocene doctrine; and his son Sigismund, who had been won over to it by Avitus during the life time of his father, first declared decidedly in its favour when he ascended the throne in the year 517.†

In a religious conference between the two parties held in the time of king Gundobad, A.D. 499, when Avitus, bishop of Vienne, finally declared that God would give his own testimony in favour of the Catholic faith at the tomb of St. Justus, and proposed a trial of this sort to the king, the Arians, on the contrary, declared, *se pro fide sua manifestanda facere nolle, ut fecerat Saul et ideo maledictus fuerat, aut recurrere ad incantationes et illicita: sufficere sibi, se habere scripturam, qua sit fortior omnibus præstigiis.* Vid. Sirmond. opera. T. II. p. 226

\* One of the great ministers of state encouraged, not without reason, to suppress this conference, for, said he, tales rixæ exasperabant animos multitudinis, et non poterat aliquid boni ex iis provenire.

† The question now arose whether those churches in which the Arians had worshipped, should, after being newly consecrated, be used for the Catholic worship; according to the hitherto prevailing custom with regard to the temples of the pagans and heretics, and according to the rule prescribed a few years before in Fr. nee, by the council of Orleans (Aurelianense) A.D. 511, in reference to the churches that had been previously used by the Arian Visi Goths, c. 10. Avitus was opposed to the proposition: partly on the fanatical ground that a place once desecrated by the worship of heretics could not be consecrated again to holy uses; but partly also for reasons which showed evidence of Christian wisdom. Occasion would be given to the heretics, should they be deprived of their churches, for raising the cry of persecution cum catholicam mansuetudinem calumnis hereticorum a'ue gentium plus decat sustinere quam facere. Quid enim tam durum quam si illi, qui aperta perversitate pareant, de confessione sibi aut martyrio blandiantur? Nor was it, indeed, a thing impossible that the present orthodox monarch might be succeeded by another inclined to Arianism; and in this case, the latter might think he had good cause for commencing a persecution of the orthodox, as a just retribution for the wrongs suffered by the other party — non sectæ sua studio; sed ex vicissitudinis retributione fecisse dicetur et nobis etiam post mortem gravandum ad peccatum reputabitur, quicquid fuerit perpessa posteritas. Or perhaps some neighbouring Arian prince might think himself called upon to inflict a retaliatory punishment on his own Catholic subjects. The council held this year at Epaona, after the conversion of Sigismund had been publicly declared, decided in its 33rd canon conformably to the opinion of Avitus.

Through this people, the first seeds of Christianity found their way to another tribe, which, in these and the next succeeding times, played the most important part in the history of the West. We mean the Franks. Clotilda, the daughter of the Burgundian king Gundobad, married Clovis, king of the Salian Franks; and this rough warrior, who probably looked upon religion as a matter of quite inferior importance, and, pagan as he was, thought one mode of worship as good as another, left her in the free exercise of her own rites, to which she was devotedly attached. She laboured to convince her lord that his idols were nothing, and to win him over to the Christian faith, by setting forth to him the almighty power of the one and only true God whom the Christians worshipped. But the pagan Clovis\* had no other standard by which to measure the power of the gods, than the military success of the nations that worshipped them; and the downfall of the Roman empire, whence the worship of the Christian's God had been derived, was convincing proof to him, of the weakness or nothingness of that being. At the same time, he made no opposition to her proposal, that their first born son should be dedicated to her God, and allowed him to be baptized.† The child, however, soon afterwards died; upon which Clovis declared that this event confirmed his opinion of the God of the Christians. But Clotilda still possessed sufficient influence over her husband, to obtain his consent to the baptism of their second child. It so happened that this child also fell sick, and Clovis already predicted its death; but the pious Clotilda, whose faith remained unshaken under every event, prayed God that its life might be spared for the promotion of his

\* Avitus states, in his letter to this king (ep. 41), that when pagan monarchs were exhorted to change their religion, they said they could not forsake the religion handed down to them from their ancestors (con-suetudinem generis et ritum paternae observationis).

† Gregory of Tours (Hist. II. 27) mentions an incident in the life of Clovis which happened in 486 while he was still a pagan. A beautiful vase taken by his soldiers from one of the churches was reclaimed by the bishop (probably Remigius of Rheims.) Clovis promised at once to restore it, as soon as he should be able to dispose of it as his portion of the booty. This accords with what Avitus writes in his letter to the king, concerning the respect he showed to the bishops while he was still a pagan: *Humilitas quam jamdudum nobis devotione impenditis, qui nunc primum professione (after his baptism which had just taken place) debetis.*

## VENERATION PAID TO ST. MARTIN OF TOURS.

glory among the heathen ; and its recovery, which speedily followed, she announced to her husband as bestowed in a *swer to her prayers.*\* The persuasion and the example of a wife, so devoted to her faith, and so zealous for its spread, would, without doubt, gradually produce on her husband's mind, though he might be unconscious of it, a deep and permanent impression, which was only strengthened by certain remarkable incidents *suited to work on the feelings and temper of the untutored Frank.*

*Martin, the former bishop of Tours, was, at that time, the object of universal veneration in France. In all circumstances of distress, bodily or spiritual, men were accustomed to seek relief from God through his intercession. His tomb, over which a church had been erected, was repaired to for relief by sick persons of every description ; and not a year passed in which many instances were not recorded of perjured men, here constrained to confess the truth or else punished by some signal judgment—of the insane, the nervous, the epileptic, the deaf and dumb, the blind, here restored to soundness and health.† The very dust from St. Martin's tomb, fragments of the wax tapers that burned before his shrine, or of the curtains that veiled it, and everything which was thought to be consecrated by having once been in contact with it, were prized as miraculous remedies or powerful amulets to remove or avert every species of evil. This veneration of St. Martin extended even to Italy and to Spain. As to the reported facts, if we leave out of the question those cases in which there may have been some coöperation of intentional fraud, we shall find many of them to differ in no respect from the facts related among believing Christians of all times, respecting answers to prayer ; though added to this, in the present case, was a reliance on *human* mediation, quite foreign from the spirit of pure Christianity. But many of these facts*

\* Similar incidents are constantly recurring in the history of missions. Compare with this, for example, the account given in the Journal of the German missionaries in India of June, 1832 ; in the *Missionary Register* for the year 1833, p. 190.

† Bishop Gregory of Tours, who flourished at the close of the sixth century, collected together all these legends in his four books *de miraculis S. Martini*—a work which, notwithstanding the many fabulous stories it records, contains a great deal of instructive matter relating to the life and manners of those times, as well as interesting facts in a psychological point of view.

also may be explained from the influence of a strong faith of devotional feelings, of an excited imagination; from the natural working of both mental and physical powers; whilst the rigid abstinence, necessary to be observed by the patients, contributed to promote their cure;\* and the ignorant who, without further inquiry, surrendered themselves to the impression of the moment, easily traced a casual connection in an accidental coincidence; and a. none were inclined to investigate the immediate natural causes of the visible facts, while an exaggerating fancy added something more to them, so the most wonderful stories were told of the extraordinary works performed by St. Martin. And if much that seemed too incredible sometimes provoked the understanding to doubt, such doubts were scouted as suggestions of the devil.

These extraordinary things which happened at St. Martin's tomb, Clotilda often related to her husband as proofs of the almighty power of the God worshipped by the Christians. Clovis, however, still professed to be incredulous; he would believe these facts when he saw them with his own eyes.†

Thus by a concurrence of impressions of various kinds, the mind of Clovis was prepared for a religious change, when by a remarkable event, which would have been attended with the same effect under no other circumstances, this change was accomplished. At the battle of Zülpich (Tolbiacum), fought between him and the Alemanni in the year 496, he found himself and his army placed in a situation of extreme peril. He invoked his gods for deliverance in vain; when calling to mind all the accounts he had heard respecting the almighty power of the Christian's God, he addressed his supplications to Him, vowing, that if by his assistance the victory should be gained, he would devote himself wholly to His service. The

\* Gregory of Tours remarks, concerning the cures performed on those supposed to be possessed of devils, and on those sick with fevers, that they could only expect relief si vere fuerint parcitas et fides conjunctæ.—*De miraculis Martini*, l. I. c. 8,—and that one individual who relapsed into his former dissipated life was attacked again. I. c. 8.

† Nicetius, bishop of Triers, writes to the Longobard queen Clodeswinde, Clotilda's aunt: *Audisti ab avia tua Chrotilde, qualiter in Franciam venerit, quomodo dominum Chlodoveum ad legem catholicam adduxerit, et quum esset astutissimus noluit acquiescere, antequam vera agnosceret. Quum illa, quæ supra dixi, probata cognovit, humiliis ad Martini limina cecidit et baptizari se sine mora permisit.* *bibl. patr. Galland. T. XII.*

enemy was conquered; and Clovis ascribed his success to the powerful arm of the Christian's God. Rejoicing over the change thus produced in her husband's mind, Clotilda sent for Remigius, the venerable bishop of Rheims, who found on his arrival the ear of the king already open for his message. When the bishop spoke of the crucifixion, the Frankish warrior *indignantly exclaimed*; “*Had I only been there with my Franks, I would have taught those Jews a better lesson.*” The festival of Easter was chosen as the day for his baptism,\* which was performed with great solemnity. It produced a wide sensation and was elaborately described † in the ~~pompous~~ rhetorico-poetical language of the times.‡ The example of the king was followed by many others, and it is reported that more than three thousand of his army received baptism at one time.§

Important, however, as was the conversion of Clovis, considered in reference to the effect which it had, by reason of his continually extending power, in enlarging the boundaries of the Christian church; yet, as in the case of Constantine, his conversion was of such a nature as to lead him, in assuming the Christian profession, to clothe his former mode of thinking

\* As we are informed in the letter of Avitus to the king, already cited, which was written shortly after his baptism: “*Ut consequenter eo die ad salutem regenerari vos pateat, quo natum redemptioni suae cœli dominum mundus accepit.*”

† Thus Gregory of Tours: *Totum templum baptisterii divino respexit ab odore talemque ibi gratiam adstantibus Deus tribuit, ut astringerent, se paradisi odoribus collocari.*

‡ The wrong interpretation of such expressions and symbolical paintings gave origin to the well-known legend some centuries later, when it was desired to have the confirmation bestowed on Clovis with the christ, or royal anoint, that an oil-vase was supernaturally provided—the so-called ampulla Remensis.

§ The important bearing which it was supposed the conversion of Clovis would have on the spread of Christianity among the races of German descent, appears from the above-mentioned congratulatory letter of Avitus. He expected that the whole nation of the Franks would now embrace Christianity, and invites the king to lend his aid by means of embassies to promote the spread of the gospel: *ut quia Deus gentem vestram per vos ex toto suam faciet, ulterioribus quoque gentibus, quas a naturali adhuc ignorantia constitutas nulla pravorum dogmatum germina corruperunt (among whom the Arian doctrines had as yet found no admission) de bono thesauro vestri cordi- fidei semina porrigitatis, nec iudeat pigeatque etiam directis in rem legationibus adstruere partes Dei, qui tantum vestras erexit.*

in a new garb, rather than to change it entirely to make room for a full and hearty admission of the gospel spirit. His worldly and political projects too much occupied his attention, or he was too busily engaged in war, to allow himself time for earnest reflection on the religion he professed, so as to understand and truly appropriate it. The God of the Christians first appeared to him as his protector in war; he would fain reckon on enjoying the assistance of the same powerful arm in the future, and he imagined that he should secure it by making rich donations to the church. He gladly seized every opportunity to throw a sacred colouring over his ambitious schemes, by pretending a zeal for the glory of God; as, in making war with the Visi-Goths who were Arians.\*

In all cases where large tribes of men are said to have been converted through the influence of their chiefs, a great deal must of course be set down as merely of an outward character: hence, when Christianity had already assumed the form of a dominant religion among the Franks, it is not surprising that idolatry should still be found to have so many votaries, that king Childebert, in the year 554, was obliged to pass a law against those who would not allow idolatrous images to be removed from their estates. The Frankish nobles, also, from this time, were anxious to secure a good foundation for their piety by rich donations to churches and monasteries, which thus became exposed still more than ever to the pillaging disposition of others; while at the same time an incentive was offered to the intrusion of worldly-minded men into the sacred office. After this followed those numberless internal dissensions, wars, and revolutions, within the Frankish empire, which encouraged barbarism and gave a check to the civilizing influences of Christianity and the church. Now, as all that can be done by any church, for the real dissemination of Christianity, depends on its own internal condition, so the truth was in the present case, that although the power of the Frankish empire opened the way for missions, and contributed

\* When the Burgundian king Gundobad was invited by Avitus bishop of Vienne and others, at the conference in 499, to abandon the Arian doctrines, and, like Clovis, profess the Catholic, he said in answer to this proposition: *non est fides, ubi est appetitio alieni et sitis sanguinis populorum, ostendat fidem per opera sua.* See D'Achery Spicilegia. T. III. ed. fol. f. 305.

much to facilitate and promote their progress, and although, in solitary instances, missions were actually sent forth by the Frankish church, yet the most important missionary efforts did not proceed from this quarter; but the dismembered church of the Franks itself needed regeneration, which was to be obtained only from some other source.

*The first impulse towards this regeneration proceeded from the same countries which sent forth also the most important missions.* Those islands at the West, which were so well adapted, by their situation, to furnish quiet and secluded seats for seminaries of Christian instruction and culture, and to serve the great purpose of dispersing abroad spiritual blessings as well as other benefits to mankind—the islands of Great Britain and Ireland were the spots, where, in retired monasteries, those men obtained their training, who were destined to be teachers and educators of the rude nations. Let us, then, first cast a glance at the history of Christianity in the islands which had so important a share in the further extension of the Christian church.

As it regards Ireland, St. Patrick had here left behind him a ~~set~~ of disciples who continued to labour on in his own spirit. Ireland became the seat of famous monasteries, which acquired the name for this country of “Island of the Saints” (*insula sanctorum*). In these monasteries the scriptures ~~were~~ diligently read; ancient books eagerly collected and studied. They formed missionary schools, such, for example, in the ~~last~~ half of the sixth century was the monastery of ~~Bangor~~, founded by the venerable abbot Comgal. After Christianity had been conveyed at a much earlier period, by Ninian, a British bishop, to the Southern provinces of the Picts in Scotland, the abbot Columba of Ireland transplanted it, about the year 565, among the northern Picts, a people separated from those of the south by lofty mountains covered with ice and snow. The Picts whom he converted gave him the island of Hy, north-west of Scotland, afterward reckoned as one of the Hebrides. Here he founded a monastery, which, under his management during thirty years, attained the highest reputation, a distant and secluded seat for the pursuit of biblical studies and other sciences according to the standard of those early times. The memory of Columba made this monastery so venerated, that its abbots had the control and guidance of the

bordering tribes and churches; and even bishops acknowledged their authority, though they were but simple priests. This island was named after himself, St. Iona (the names Columba and Iona being probably, one the Latin, the other the Hebrid translation of an originally Irish word), St. Columba, and the Island of Columcelli, Colum Kill.\*

While in this way, Christianity was planted among the Scots and Picts, even to the extreme north of these islands, the Christian church had been forced out of its original seat, in ancient Britain, England proper. The Britons—among whom Christianity had already found entrance, having probably been brought to them directly or indirectly from the East as early as the latter part of the second century—were, from very remote times, a Christian nation; though great corruptions had sprung up and become spread among all ranks of the people. † Finding themselves unable to resist the destructive inroads of their ancient foes, the Picts and Scots, or to obtain any assistance from the feeble Roman empire, the Britons had betaken themselves, about the middle of the fifth century, to the warlike German tribe of the Anglo-Saxons. The latter, however, made themselves masters of the country; leaving only the western portion to its old possessors, while they themselves founded the empire of the Anglo-Saxon Heptarchy. It was now, indeed, in the power of the Britons to do much for the conversion of that pagan tribe; but the existing national hate between the conquerors and the conquered ‡ forbade it. It was not till a century and a half later, that the Roman bishop, Gregory the Great, a man ardently bent on promoting the kingdom of God, and whose far-reaching eye, in spite of difficulties which seemed ever springing up afresh, embraced among its objects the remote and the near, drew up a plan for founding the Christian church among the Anglo-Saxons. An impression he had received in his earlier years, before he be-

\* Columba was named as founder of several monasteries. See the traditions respecting him collected in *Usserii Britannicarum ecclesiarum antiquitatis*, ed. II. p. 362 f.

† As the fact is described by the presbyter Gildas—a man sprung from the midst of this people—in a work in which he represents the capture and devastation of the country by the Anglo-Saxons, as a divine judgment—his work *De excidio Britanniae*.

‡ Gildas calls the Anglo-Saxons *nefandi nominis Saxonii, Deo hominibusque invisi.*

came a bishop, and while abbot of a monastery in Rome, first set him upon this project. Strolling to the public mart, he stopped to observe the foreign traders there engaged in opening and exposing their merchandize for sale, when his attention was caught by certain boys, brought from afar, and distinguished for their noble air, who were waiting to be sold. He inquired after their country, and learned to his great grief that a people so distinguished by nature, were as yet wholly destitute of the higher gifts of grace. He at once resolved to go himself and convey to them these blessings, and he would have done so, had he not at the instigation of the Roman church been recalled by the then Roman bishop, when already several days on his journey.\* But the plan itself he could never abandon; and he seems, when bishop of Roine, to have been devising, from the first, how he might best carry his purpose into effect. Thus, he directed the presbyter whom he had sent to take charge of the property belonging to the Roman church in France, to expend part of the money collected in Gaul in the purchase of such Anglo-Saxon youths as might be exposed for sale, and to send them in company with an ecclesiastic, who could baptize them in case of mortal sickness, to Rome; in order that they might there be instructed and trained in the monasteries.† Perhaps it was his intention to employ them, after they had been perfectly disciplined in the monastic life, as missionaries among their countrymen. Meantime an event had occurred, peculiarly well suited to favour the projected mission. Ethelbert, king of Kent, then the mightiest among the small kingdoms of the Heptarchy, had married Bertha, a Frankish, Christian princess. She had connected with her household a certain bishop Liu-thard, and was allowed freely to observe the rites of her religion. From her, therefore, the missionaries might expect to find, at once, a favourable reception and support. The vigilant Gregory, whom nothing escaped which could be made serviceable in promoting his great work, may have been moved by this very circumstance to proceed to the execution of his plan. Accordingly, in the year 596, he sent Augustin, a Roman abbot, together with several associates,‡ among whom

\* Beda hist. ang. II. I.

† Epp. 1. VI. ep. VII.

‡ He was abbot of the monastery which had been founded by Gregory himself when he retired from the world. Monasterii mei præpositus. l. IV. ep. 108.

were Peter the monk, and the presbyter Laurentius, to England. These persons while on their journey were frightened at the report of the difficulties and dangers which threatened them; and sent Augustin back to the Roman bishop, to obtain a release from their commission; whereupon Gregory, in a friendly, but earnest appeal,\* exhorted them to finish the good work commenced with God's help: since it were far better not to begin a good enterprise, than, having begun it, to look back. They should remember, that great and painful labours would be followed by the reward of everlasting glory. On their journey through France, from which country they were to cross over to England, Gregory recommended them to the Frankish princes and nobles, whose connection with the Anglo-Saxon rulers might be made of service to them; and he also bade them take interpreters from the Frankish kingdom.

In 597, Augustin, with forty companions, landed on the isle of Thanet, eastward of Kent, and sent to inform the king of the purpose for which they were come. The king made his appearance on the next day, to confer with them on the subject. Fearful of magic, he did not venture his person under the same roof with them; but would only confer with them in the open air. But Augustin's words inspired him with confidence, and he declared that he now saw they had honest intentions, and that they had come from so great a distance to communicate to him that which they considered to be the greatest and best of blessings.\* Yet he could not so lightly and quickly abandon the religion of his nation and of his fathers. All he could do at present by way of acknowledging their good intentions, was this:—he would furnish them a dwelling and the means of support at his capital, Dorovern, Canterbury, and they might be allowed to convince such as they could of the truth of their religion, and afterwards to baptize them. Thus the missionaries commenced their labours on a small scale. They took no more than barely sufficed for their scanty diet. Their disinterested, severe mode of life gained for them esteem and confidence. An old, dilapidated church belonging to the Roman times, and consecrated to St. Martin, afforded them the first place for divine worship, where they baptized the new Christians, and held with them their

*religious meetings.* It is certain, that the propagation of Christianity among this rude people was helped forward by a concurrence of circumstances, or facts, which appeared to the people as miracles, and were also regarded as such by Augustin. By impressions of this kind, effects great for the moment, though not of an enduring character, may have been produced; and the missionaries themselves may have suffered themselves to be deceived by the unexpected and surprising success of their labours. Even the king, who had been gradually prepared for it through the influence of his Christian wife, decided to embrace the gospel, and was baptized. Yet he declared, in publicly professing Christianity, that he would not make his own religious persuasion a law for his subjects; but in this would leave each one to his own free choice; since Augustin had taught him, that the Christian worship of God must proceed from conviction, and could not be extorted by outward force. It may be safely conjectured, that Augustin had been directed by the Roman bishop, to aim at extending the faith, by instruction and persuasion, by acts of love winning the heart, and not by forcible measures; for a correct insight into the nature of divine worship generally, and of Christianity in particular, as well as the spirit of charity by which he was animated, had led bishop Gregory to adopt this as a principle, though he by no means always acted in conformity with it in practice.\* Still, the king distinguished by peculiar marks of

\* We may here compare together Gregory's different modes of procedure in these matters. When blind zeal, or selfish passions, making use of religion as a pretext, disturbed the Jews in the free exercise of their worship in the synagogues secured to them by the ancient laws, Gregory stood forth as their protector, and emphatically remonstrated against such conduct. To this, course, he might be led in these cases, simply by a regard for justice, and zeal for the preservation of order; as the Jews were threatened to be deprived, in an arbitrary manner, of the rights secured to them by law—a reason which he himself alleges against such proceedings; *L. I. ep. 10.* “Hebraeos gravari vel affligi contra ordinem rationis prohibemus: sed sicut Romanis vivere legibus permittuntur, annuente justitia acti suos, ut norint, nullo impediente disponant,” and *L. VIII. ep. 25.* “Iudari in his, quæ sis concessa sunt, nullum debent prajudicium sustinere.” But he also declared himself opposed to all attempts whatever to convert the Jews by forcible measures—because the very opposite effect might be produced from what was intended. The only proper way of dealing with them, in his opinion, was by instructing and convincing them. *L. IX. ep. 47,* to the bishops of Arles and of Marseilles: “Dum enim quispiam ad baptismatis fontem non

favour those who followed his own example in religion. The example and influence of the monarch, and the sensuous impressions produced by the miracles, which the people supposed they beheld, induced great numbers to receive baptism; with many of whom, however, as was shown by succeeding events, the faith had taken no deep root. On one Christmas festival, Augustin was enabled to baptize more than ten thousand pagans,\* to which momentary, and apparently great success,

prædicationis suavitate, sed necessitate pervenerit, ad pristinam superstitionem remeans, inde deterius moritur, unde renatus esse videbatur. Fraternitas ergo vestra hujus modi homines frequenti prædicatione provocet, quatenus mutare veterem vitam magis de doctoris suavitate desiderent, adhibendus ergo est illis sermo, qui et errorum in ipsis spinas frere debeat et prædicando quod in his tenebrescit illuminet." And in a letter to the bishop of Naples, L. XIII. ep. 12: "cur Judæis, qualiter cærimonias suas colere debeant, regulas ponimus, si per hoc eos lucrari non possumus? agendum ergo est, ut ratione potius et mansuetudine provocati, sequi nos velint, non fugere, ut eis ex eorum codicibus ostendentes quæ dicimus, ad sinum matris ecclesiæ Deo possimus adjuvante convertere." And I. ep. 35. "eos, qui a religione Christiana discordant, mansuetudine, benignitate, admonendo, suadendo, ad unitatem fidei necesse est congregare, ne, quos dulcedo prædicationis et præventus futuri judicis terror ad credendum invitare poterat, minis et terroribus repellantur." Still Gregory did not always act according to the principles here expressed. Thus, for example, he directed that the Jews, whose estates were held of property belonging to the Roman church in Sicily, should be exempted from a certain portion of the rents to be paid off them, if they consented to receive baptism. Now he must certainly have been aware, that conversions so brought about, could not be sincere; but he thought: "et si ipsi minus fideliter veniunt, hi tamen, qui de eis nati fuerint, jum fidelius baptizantur." I. V. ep. 7. And he directed that the peasantry still devoted to paganism in Sardinia, should be induced, by taxing them beyond their means of payment, to renounce their religion, ut ipsa reactionis suæ pœna compellantur ad rectitudinem festinare. I. IV. ep. 26. Those who still persisted in idolatry, should, if they belonged to the class of bondmen, be punished corporeally, and if to the freemen, with close imprisonment, ut qui salubria et a mortis periculo revocantia audire verba contemnunt, cruciatus saltem eos corporis ad desideratam mentis valeant reducere sanitatem. I. IX. ep. 85. I. VIII. ep. 18.

\* Gregory says, in his letter to Eulogius bishop of Alexandria, I. VIII. ep. 30, touching the conversion of the English people by means of Augustin: "quia tantis miraculis vel ipse vel hi, qui cum eo transmissi sunt, in gente eadem coruscant, ut apostolorum virtutes in signis quæ exhibent, imitari videantur." He then cites the account of the baptism of this great multitude on the last Christmas festival. And p. 27 in c. 36. Job. c. 21. Omnipotens Dominus emicantibus prædicatorum miraculis ad fidem etiam terminos mandi perduxit. Lingua Britanniæ, quæ nil

Augustin attached too much importance. In obedience to the instructions of Gregory, he now crossed over to France, and received from Etherich, bishop of Arles, the episcopal *ordination, in order that he might perform in the new church the duties of a bishop.* He next despatched to Rome his two associates, the presbyter Laurentius, and Peter the monk, in order to give pope Gregory, whom he had probably informed already in a general manner of the great success of his labours, a more detailed account of his proceedings; to receive instructions as to the course he ought to pursue, with regard to disputed points, in settling the order of the new church, so that a firm shaping might be given to it by papal authority; and also to demand of the pope new assistance for a work requiring so much labour. In the first letter, or one of the first of Gregory to Augustin, he expressed his great joy at what had been done in England. He recognized in this, the hand of Him, who said, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I also work;" but at the same time, he warned the missionary in the language of true Christian wisdom. Augustin might well rejoice, he said, that by outward signs and wonders, the souls of the English had been drawn to inward grace; but in the consciousness of human weakness, he should ever be on the watch against pride. He reminded him of our Saviour's words to his disciples, when they returned from their first mission, and testified their joy, that the evil spirits were made subject to them in his name (Luke x. 20); how he turned their minds away from all selfish and temporal grounds of joy, to universal and enduring ones; for the disciples of truth should rejoice only in the good which is common to all, and in that which is the end of all joy. As a check to spiritual pride in its *first* beginnings, he advised him straitly to examine and prove himself, and to be ever mindful of the end for which this *gift* was bestowed on him: that he had only received it for the salvation of those among whom he laboured. He held up to him as a warning the example of Moses, who, though the instrument, under God, of so many miracles, yet was not permitted himself to enter the promised land. He also reminded him, that miracles were no certain evidence of election; for

aliud noverat, quan barbarum frenderet, jam dudum in Divinis laudibus  
Hebreum cœpit alleluja resonare.

our Lord had said, that many who appealed to the wonderful works they had done, would not be received by him, Matth. vii. 22. One mark alone had our Lord given, in the possession of which his disciples might truly rejoice, and recognize in it the glory of election,—the mark of his discipleship, which is love, John xiii. 33. This I write to thee—says Gregory—that I may exhort thee to humility; but to humility thou must join a confident trust in God. “I who am a sinner—exclaims the pope—entertain the most confident assurance, that through the grace of our almighty Creator and Redeemer, thy sins are already forgiven thee, and that thou art a chosen instrument to procure the forgiveness of their sins for others ”\*

• Gregory sent him some new assistants · choosing, as a friend and favourer of the monastic life, none but monks for this purpose, over whom he placed, as superior, the abbot Mellitus. To the latter, he gave an exhortatory, pastoral letter, together with presents to the king. By the same hand, he sent to Augustin the pall, which marked the dignity of an archbishop; copies of the sacred Scriptures, relics to be used in the consecration of the new churches, together with several ecclesiastical vessels, and a reply to the questions which had been proposed to him; questions which, it must be confessed, betrayed some narrowness of mind in the proposer. Augustin, in his journey through France, had been struck, among other things, by the difference between many of the church customs prevailing in Gaul and the Roman usages, and he asked the Roman bishop why it was, that with but one faith, the church should so differ in its ritual. To this Gregory replied, that although he had been brought up in the Roman church, still he ought by no means, in settling the order of the new church, to follow exclusively the example of Rome; but should select the good from all quarters, where it was to be found, whether in the Gallic church or elsewhere; for the thing ought not to be loved on

\* Lib. XI. ep. 28. The more Gregory was inclined to believe in miracles wrought in his own times, and to regard them as manifest tokens of divine interference to advance the weal of the church, the more remarkable it appears, that he still by no means over-rated the importance of miracles as a means of furthering the kingdom of God; and that he was ever decidedly opposed to that fleshly eagerness for miracles which mistakes the Christian conception of a miracle and the essence of the higher life. We shall unfold his remarkable ideas on this subject, when we come to speak of his character generally. See below.

account of the place, but only the place on account of the thing,—a warning against the bigoted attachment to Roman forms, which deserves notice as coming from the mouth of a Roman bishop. At first it was Gregory's intention, which he intimated, indeed, to King Ethelbert,\* to have all the temples of idolatry destroyed; but on maturer reflection, he altered his mind, and despatched a letter after the abbot Mellitus,† in which he declared, that the idol-temples, if well built, ought not to be destroyed, but sprinkled with holy water, and sanctified by holy relics, should be converted into temples of the living God; so that the people might be the more easily induced to assemble in their accustomed places.‡ Moreover, the festivals in honour of the idols, of which the rude people had been deprived, should be replaced by others, either on the anniversaries of the consecration of churches, or on days devoted to the memory of the saints, whose relics were deposited in them. On such days, the people should be taught to erect arbors around the churches, in which to celebrate their festive meals, and thus be holden to thank the giver of all good for these temporal gifts. Being thus allowed to indulge in some sensual enjoyments, they could be the more easily led to those which are inward and spiritual. It was impossible, he said, for rude and untutored minds to receive all things at once.§

In appointing Augustin to be the first archbishop over the new church, it was Gregory's intention to make London the seat of this archbishopric, to which twelve bishoprics were to be subordinate. As soon as Christianity should be extended so far to the north, the second metropolis was to be established at Eboracum (York); and the two archbishoprics were, for all future time, to be independent of each other, equal in dignity, and subject only to the bishop of Rome.|| That is; he marked out the church dioceses by the rank which the cities of England had acquired under the Roman dominion. From the history of those earlier times he had become well

\* L. XI. ep. 66.

† L. XI. ep. 76.

‡ Ad loca, que conseruit, familiarius concurrat.

§ Gregory appeals here to the example of the divine method for educating mankind. He regards the Jewish sacrificial worship as a transfer of that which was practised in the worship of idols to the worship of the true God.

|| See L. XI. ep. 65.

acquainted with the cities of *Londinum* and *Eboracum*; but not with *Dorovern* (Canterbury), which had first risen to notice as capital of one of the seven Anglo-Saxon kingdoms. But to make London, which belonged to another government, the seat of the first archbishopric, was, of course, beyond Augustin's power. He could only select for this purpose the chief city of the kingdom in which he had first planted the Christian church; and hence, in this particular, it was necessary to deviate from the papal instruction. But of the negotiations which took place between Augustin and the Roman bishop on this subject, we know nothing. When, however, through the influence of king Ethelbert, whose niece had married Sabert, king of Essex, a door was opened for the introduction of Christianity into this province, Augustin established an archbishopric for this portion of the Heptarchy at London, and gave it over to Mellitus.

By the instructions of the Roman bishop, Augustin was to have supreme direction not only over the newly established Anglo-Saxon, but also over the ancient British church; for he went on the principle that to him, as successor of St. Peter, belonged the spiritual power over the whole Western church. Augustin who, with all his pious zeal, seems not to have been wholly exempt from spiritual pride and ambition, was unwilling to yield a particle of his dignity, as primate over the entire English church, or to tolerate any spiritual authority in England independent of his own. He considered it, moreover, as highly important, when the labourers for the church which was to be built up among a pagan people were so few, to gain the active co-operation of the numerous clergy and monks of the British race. But as the Britons had not received their Christianity from Rome, but directly or indirectly from the East, they had not been used to reverence the Roman church as their mother-church, nor to place themselves in any relation of dependence upon it. Their long separation from the rest of Western Christendom had naturally served to strengthen and confirm in them the spirit of ecclesiastical freedom. They had, moreover, from the most ancient times, given a different form to many parts of the ritual, from that which prevailed in the Roman church; they differed, for example, in the time for observing Easter, in the form of tonsure among

the clergy, and in the mode of baptism. Augustin's bigoted attachment to the forms of the Roman church, as well as his spiritual pride, did not qualify him to pass a charitable judgment on these diversities, or to seek the means of reconciling them. The abbot of the most distinguished British monastery, at Bangor, Deynoch by name, whose opinion in ecclesiastical affairs had the most weight with his countrymen, when urged by Augustin to submit in all things to the ordinances of the Roman church, gave him the following remarkable answer :—

“We are all ready to listen to the church of God, to the pope at Rome, and to every pious Christian, that so we may show to each, according to his station, perfect love, and uphold him by word and deed. We know not, that any other obedience can be required of us towards him whom you call the pope or the father of fathers. But *this* obedience we are prepared constantly to render to him and to every Christian.”\*

At the suggestion of king Ethelbert, the bishops of the nearest British province were invited to hold a conference with Augustin about these matters ; and a council for this purpose was held, according to the ancient German custom, near an oak.† It was quite characteristic of Augustin, that when he found the Britons were not disposed to yield, he proposed that a sick man should be brought before them, whom both the parties should try to restore by their prayers, and that the answer given should be considered as a decision of the question by the divine judgment. The Britons finally declared, that they could do nothing without the consent of a larger number of their party. But previous to the calling of a more numerous church assembly, they consulted the opinion of a pious hermit, who stood with them in the highest veneration. He told them they might follow Augustin, if he was a man of God. When they inquired how they were to know whether he was a man of God, he replied, if he be meek and lowly of spirit, after the pattern of our Lord, it is to be expected that, as a disciple of Christ, he will bear himself the yoke of his Master,

\* See the Anglo-Saxon original of these words, with the Latin version, in Wilkins' Collection of English councils, or in Bede's Hist. eccles. Angl. ed. Smith. f. 116.

† Which place was still called in the time of Bede, Augustin's oak. The synod at Wigorn, A.D. 601.

and will lay no heavier burden on others. But if he is of a violent, overbearing spirit, it is plain that he is not born of God; and we should pay no regard to his words. When they inquired still further by what signs they might know whether he was a meek and humble man, he said they should allow him and his attendants to enter first into the place where they were to assemble; and if upon their entrance he rose to meet them, they should acknowledge him as a servant of Christ. But not so, if, notwithstanding their great superiority to his own party in numbers, he still remained sitting. This proof of humility Augustin failed to show; and the Britons refused to enter with him into any terms of agreement. "Well, then," he is said to have indignantly exclaimed, "as you are unwilling to recognize the Anglo-Saxons as brethren, and to preach to them the word of life, you shall have them as foes, and experience their vengeance." The national hatred of the Anglo-Saxons towards the Britons, which by this church schism Augustin was the means of fomenting, would easily bring about the fulfilment of his threat.\* But the relation of the Britons to the Anglo-Saxon, and to the Roman church, had an important influence on the history of the church in the West during the next succeeding centuries, for we afterwards find many traces of a reaction against the Roman hierarchy, proceeding from the spirit of ecclesiastical freedom among the Britons.

Upon the death of Augustin, in 605, he was succeeded, in accordance with his own wishes, by Laurentius. But the new church had by no means been established as yet on a firm basis, calculated to withstand every change of circumstances; for, as we have already remarked, the conversion of many to Christianity had been brought about by the example and the influence of their king, or by momentary impressions on the senses, rather than by any well-grounded conviction. Hence on the death of Ethelbert, in the year 616, a great change

\* Though according to the common reading in Bede, from which, however, the old Anglo-Saxon translation varies, king Ethelbert's attack on the Britons, by which much blood was shed on both sides, took place after Augustin's death, and cannot be attributed to his immediate influence; still, considering his influence on the state of feeling of the Anglo-Saxon people towards the Britons, we cannot exempt him from the charge of having been at least indirectly concerned in this transaction.

immediately ensued. His son Eadbald relapsed into the old idolatry, which imposed fewer restraints upon his licentious habits; and his example was followed by many. A like change took place also in Essex, where Christianity was still less firmly rooted. After the death of king Sabert, the three sons whom he left behind him, openly declared again in favour of paganism, which, indeed, they had never heartily renounced. They had never consented to receive baptism; but still they were unwilling to be excluded from participating of the beautiful white bread,\* distributed by the bishop in celebrating the eucharist—whether it was that they were attracted by the bread itself, or whether they attributed to it some magical charm, as they might easily be led to do by the customary language of those times, in describing the effects of the holy supper. As Mellitus, bishop of London, could not allow of this, he was banished, with all his clergy. He repaired to the bishop Laurentius in Kent, to consult with him, as to what was next to be done. It was already agreed, that where there was such obstinate resistance, the mission must be abandoned. And even Laurence was on the point of following the steps of his departed companions, the bishops Mellitus and Justus; but his conscience reproached him for being willing to abandon the post which God had entrusted to him. After fervent prayer, and many tears, on the night before the day appointed for his departure, he threw himself down on some chaff in the church of St. Peter and St. Paul. As he fell asleep amidst painful thoughts of the future, St. Peter appeared to him in a dream, and severely upbraided him for not being afraid thus to forsake the hearth which had been committed to his charge.† We may suppose that the young king

\* *Panis nitidus*, in the words of Bede. This might be understood as meaning, that even at this period it was customary to use a peculiar kind of bread, unleavened bread, in the celebration of the eucharist; but it may also be understood to mean, that it was customary to use white and fine bread prepared expressly for the occasion.

† It is possible, to be sure, that Laurence, going on the principle of the “pious fraud,” ventured upon a fiction for the purpose of operating on the mind of the young king; yet the other view so naturally presents itself, that we find no good reason for recurring to this. If everything happened in the way Bede relates, and Laurence exhibited to the prince the marks left by the scourge, this indeed might lead to the hypothesis, that although Laurence really had a vision of this sort, yet he resorted

Eadbal<sup>d</sup> had not been able wholly to suppress the lessons of Christianity received by him in childhood ; but that these early impressions had only been obliterated for a season by the tide of sensual pleasures. And thus we may understand, how the terrifying description which Laurence drew of the vision he had seen, should so work upon his imagination, as to revive the impressions which still lay concealed in the secret chambers of his heart. Laurence would make the best of this opportunity to rekindle the spark of faith, still lingering, though smothered by sensuality, in the breast of the king. He submitted to baptism, wholly renounced idolatry, and moreover forsook the forbidden connections, which he had hitherto refused to give up.

For a longer time, paganism maintained its ground in the province of Essex. But from Kent Christianity was spread to another of the small kingdoms, which became a principal point for the wider diffusion of the gospel—namely Northumberland. Edwin, the king of this province, had married Ethelberga, a sister of king Eadbal<sup>d</sup> of Kent ; but under the express stipulation, that she should be allowed to take her clergy with her, and practise without molestation the Christian worship of God. Paulinus was appointed to go with her as bishop, and Eboracum (York), the chief town of the province, became afterwards the seat of the new bishopric. Paulinus laboured, with great zeal, to convert the prince and the people. He met with little success among the people, till he had succeeded in gaining over the former to the gospel. But king Edwin was not so easily brought to a decision in his religious convictions. He came to it only after serious examination. He had already been satisfied of the vanity of idols, and had ceased to worship them ; but he did not, as yet, make profession of Christianity. He declared that he must, in the first place, make himself better acquainted with its doctrines, and more carefully consult about them, with the wisest of

to a trick in order that his story might make a stronger impression on the king's mind. But at the same time, it is impossible to calculate by what circumstances it might happen that he himself was deceived ; or it may be that the original facts were magnified into the miraculous by the transmission of the story. It is to be remarked, that many stories from the older times, respecting such miraculous visitations for the punishment of sin, were current in the church.

his nation; and he frequently occupied himself in silent religious meditations. Seizing a favourable moment, when the king was alone and buried in such meditations, Paulinus, taking advantage of a vision which, as he had been accidentally informed, once appeared to the king when in a hazardous and eventful situation, prevailed upon him to convoke an assembly of his priests and nobles, which Paulinus also was to attend, for the purpose of deciding on the great question of religion. Many voices were here heard to speak for the first time against the old idolatry. To illustrate how important it must be for man to arrive at certainty in the things of religion, one of the chiefs used the following ingenious comparison : " As when in winter, the king and his nobles and servants have met at a feast, and are couched around the fire blazing in the centre of the hall, and feel nothing of the cold, and of the rough weather of the season, while the storm and the snow-blasts are raging without, and a little sparrow flies quickly through, entering in at one door and passing out at the other :—what the moment which the bird passes in the warm hall, without feeling anything of the rough weather, is to the whole long remainder of the time, which it has spent, and must again spend, amidst the storms, such is the present short moment of time which we know, compared to that which has gone before us, and to that which follows after us, of which we know nothing. With good reason then, may we feel ourselves bound to receive this new doctrine, if it reveals anything more certain on these matters." Then, after Paulinus had expounded the Christian doctrine, the chief priest himself was the first to propose the destruction of the ancient idols, and riding to the spot which formed the principal seat of the idol worship, set the example of destroying the old objects of veneration. But king Edwin, the most zealous labourer for the spread of Christianity, died in battle, in the year 633. After his death, the condition of his people changed for the worse under a hostile dominion, and paganism once more obtained the ascendancy ; until Oswald, a man of the royal family, appeared as the liberator of his people, and the triumphant restorer of the Christian church among them. While living in banishment among the Scots in Ireland, he had been instructed in Christianity, and baptized, by pious monks : and through their influence he was filled with an ardent zeal for the Christian faith.

Before proceeding to battle, he planted a cross in the ground, knelt before it in prayer, and besought the Almighty, that by his arm he would bestow the victory on the righteous cause.\* Having, by the help of his God, conquered an enemy superior to him in numbers, it was his firm resolution to do his utmost to make the worship of this his God universal among his people. He applied to the Scottish church, from which he had received his own knowledge of Christianity, to send him a teacher for his people. Selection was made of one of those monks, distinguished for the austerity of their lives, of whom Ireland was at that time the nursing school. But this stern man could not bring himself to condescend to the rudeness, to the weaknesses, and wants of a people who were to be gradually formed by Christianity. The people were repelled by his rigid manners. Despairing of being able to effect anything among them, he returned back to his country; and in an assembly of his spiritual superiors he declared, that the people were too rude to receive any benefit from his labours. But among the persons assembled was Aidan, a monk from the island of Iona, whence came the austerest monks; and this person, severe to himself, was none the less full of love and gentleness to others.† To the missionary who complained of the people to whom he had been sent as a teacher, he said that his want of success was his own fault; that he had proceeded so roughly with his untutored hearers, that he had not, according to the precept of St. Paul, fed them at first with milk, until, nourished by the word of God, they became capable of advancing to a higher stage of the Christian life. All were convinced that the rude people needed for their teacher just such a man as he was himself. Aidan was conse-

\* The place where this is said to have occurred, was pointed out for a long time afterwards, and the memory of it deemed sacred. It was visited, as well as the pretended relics of that wooden cross, for the cure of bodily maladies.

† In the Irish monasticism, however, was incorporated a principle, derived from a certain Gildas, and opposed to the spiritual pride of an extravagant ascetism: "Abstinentia corporalium ciborum absque caritate inutilis est; meliores sunt ergo, qui non magnopere jejunant nec supra modum a creatura Dei se abstinent cor intrinsecus nitidum coram Deo servantes, quam illi, qui carnem non edunt neque vehiculis equisque vehuntur et pro his quasi superiores ceteris se putantes, quibus mors intrat per fenestram elevationis." See Wilkins's *Concil. Angl.* t. I. f. 4.

erated a bishop, and sent to Northumberland. Until he had gained a competent knowledge of the English tongue, he preached only to the chief men and servants of the king, assembled at his court ; and as the king during his exile had made himself acquainted with the Scottish language, the latter translated on the spot into the vernacular tongue, for the understanding of the hearers, the matter of these discourses. No sooner, however, had Aidan himself so far mastered the English language, as to be able to make himself understood in it, than unsparing of labour, and but seldom using a horse, he visited the city and the country around, and wheresoever he fell in with rich or poor, detained them, until he had found out whether they were still pagans or had already become believers, and had received baptism. In the first case, he began by preaching to them the gospel ; in the second, he exhorted them with a few directions to prove their faith by their good works. He accomplished much, because his life was so consonant with his zealous preaching ; because everything he did, testified to his disinterested love which was ready for any sacrifice. Whenever he received presents from the king or from the nobles, he distributed the whole among the poor, or expended it in redeeming captives ; and to many of these he afterwards imparted spiritual instruction, till he had educated them for the office of priests. To the rich and powerful he boldly spoke the truth ; reprimanding whatever was bad without respect of persons. Ecclesiastics, monks and laity who fell into his company, he constantly kept employed in reading the Holy Scriptures. By this joint activity of the zealous king and such a man, a firm foundation was laid for the church in this district. It is true, that after a reign of eight years, Oswald met his death in battle with the pagan tribe of the Mercians, A.D. 642 ; but as by a life corresponding to the faith which he professed, he had done much to recommend that faith to his people, so the manner in which he had sacrificed his life for the independence of his people served but to deepen and confirm this impression. His name was cherished in the affections and respect of his nation, and hence soon began to be honoured as that of a saint. Miracles were said to be wrought at his tomb, and by his relics ; and indeed the faith in them prevailed through the whole of these islands.

From this province, Christianity continued to spread, till the last half of the seventh century, to all the tribes of the Anglo-Saxon Heptarchy ; and in part, native and Frankish ecclesiastics, acting in dependence on the Roman church, and partly, British and Scottish clergy, who were accustomed to act with more freedom, laboured for the conversion and for the instruction of these tribes. Last of all, the inhabitants of the province of South Saxony (Sussex) were converted to Christianity. Their king, it is true, had been baptized before ; but the people continued still to be devoted to their old idolatry ; and a few Scottish monks, who had founded a monastery in the wilderness, and led an austere life, were unable by that means to gain the confidence of the rude people, or to find any opportunity of preaching to them the gospel. It so happened, that Wilfrid, archbishop of York, a descendant from an English family, was deposed from his office by occasion of a quarrel with his king ; and he here sought for a field of labour. He better understood how to let himself down to the wants of the untutored multitude. On coming among them, he found them in circumstances of great distress ; a drought occasioned by the want of rain having been followed by a severe famine. The neighbouring lakes and rivers afforded, it is true, abundance of fish ; but the rude people were still wholly ignorant of the mode of taking them, and only knew a way of fishing for eels. He caused, therefore, all the nets to be collected together, and his attendants caught three hundred fishes of different kinds. A third part of these he distributed among the poor ; another third he gave to those who furnished the nets, and the remainder he reserved for his companions. Having thus, by such gifts and instruction in the art of fishing, relieved the temporal necessities of the people, he found them the more inclined to receive instruction from him in spiritual things. A favourable impression was made on the minds of the people by the circumstance that, on the day when he first baptized a large number of them, copious showers of rain, which had long been needed, fell from the skies.\* Next, he spared no pains in laying a deeper and

\* But it is evident, that while such a coincidence of the introduction of Christianity or of baptism among a pagan race of men with fortunate events, might appear to them as a divine token in favour of the new religion, and contribute to render their minds more favourable to its recep-

firmer foundation for Christianity in the hearts and minds of the people, by providing means for the instruction of the youth, in the establishment of schools throughout the country.\*

Since, however, as we have remarked, monks and ecclesiastics who were born, or who had received their education, in Scotland or Ireland, and Anglo-Saxon or Frankish bishops, who acted in the interests of the Roman church, came and laboured together in England, the difference in ecclesiastical usages between the British-Scotch and the Roman church, could hardly fail to present an ever-fruitful subject of contention. Bede, the historian of the English church, though standing himself in this controversy on the opposite side, yet draws a most favourable picture of the pious, disinterested zeal manifested by the Scottish missionaries. The veneration, which they thus procured for themselves, gave still more weight to their influence in promoting Christianity, and nourishing the vigour of the Christian life. Hence clergy and monks, wherever they appeared, were received with joy; a circle was soon formed around them to listen to the words of Christian edification; and they were even visited for this purpose by the laity in their monasteries.† Although Augustin,

tion, so the same prejudice by which men were led to consider what was connected in the sequence of time, as connected also in the sequence of cause and effect, might, in cases of unlooked for calamity, have an unfavourable influence on the state of feeling towards Christianity. Thus, in East Saxony, a desolating sickness, following directly after the introduction of Christianity, occasioned a momentary relapse of many into idolatry. Bede III. 30. Hence Gregory showed his wisdom, when he wrote to king Ethelbert of Kent, after his conversion, that he was not to expect from his embracing Christianity some golden period of earthly felicity; but should understand that in the last ages of the world many trials were to be looked for: “appropinquante mundi termino multa imminent, quæ antea non fuerunt, videlicet immutaciones aëris, terroresque de celo, et contra ordinem temporum tempestates, bella, famæ, pestilètiae, terre motus per loca. Vos itaque, si qua de his evenire in terra vestra cognoscitis, nullo modo vestrum animum perturbetis, quia idecirco haec signa de fine saeculi premituntur, ut de animabus nostris debeamus esse solliciti, de mortis hora suspecti et venturo judici in bonis actibus inveniamur esse preparati.” Gregor. I. XI. ep. 66.

\* Bede III. 18.

† Etiam si in itinere pergeus (Clericus aliquis aut monachus) inveniatur, adcurrebant et flexo cervice vel manu signari vel ore illius se benedici gaudebant, verbis quoque horum exhortatoriis diligenter audi-

the founder of the English church, had attached so much importance to this difference of rites, yet men afterwards learned to estimate it as a minor consideration compared with the salutary doctrines, for the spread and establishment of which, labourers of both parties zealously exerted themselves. Particularly striking was the difference in the time of observing Easter under the administration of the above-mentioned bishop Aidan; for it so happened, that the king and the queen, who had been instructed by different teachers, pursued opposite courses in this respect, and while the king celebrated his Easter, the queen was still holding her fasts. The universal respect which bishop Aidan had acquired, caused this difference to be overlooked; for men could not deny it to their own minds, as Bede finely remarks, that although the bishop could not depart, in celebrating the Easter festival, from the usage of the church that had sent him; yet he took every pains to promote works of piety, faith, and charity, after the customary manner of all holy men.\* But in the times which immediately followed, it became necessary for men to decide between the Roman and the Scottish church influences; and the manner in which this decision was made, could not fail to be attended with the most important effects on the shaping of ecclesiastic relations over all England; for had the Scottish tendency prevailed, England would have obtained a more free church constitution, and a reaction against the Romish hierarchical system would have ever continued to go forth from this quarter. Yet in the mode in which Christianity had been first introduced into Kent, the victory was already prepared for the system of the Roman church; and to this was added the activity of the missionaries and clergy sent afterwards from Rome, or who came over from France. In proportion as, by their means, the authority of the Roman church gained the ascendancy, entire conformity with the Roman usages would

tum prebebant. Sed et diebus dominicis ad ecclesiam sive ad monasteria certatim non reficiendi corporis; sed audiendi sermonis Dei gratia confluabant, et si quis sacerdotum in vicum forte deveniret, mox congregati in unum vicani verbum vitae ab illo expetere curabant. Beda hist. angl. III. 26.

\* *Etsi pascha contra morem eorum, qui ipsum miserant, facere non petuit, opera tamen fidei, pietatis et dilectionis juxta morem omnibus sanctis diligenter exsequi curavit.* l. III. c. 25.

become more universally prevalent. Under Colmann, who succeeded, next but one, the above-mentioned bishop Aidan, a man likewise of Scottish descent, greater importance was attached to this controversy, and a conference for the purpose of deciding the matter in dispute, was held in presence of king Oswin and of his successor Alfred, in the year 664.\* Bishop Colmann, who defended the Scottish usage, appealed to the example of the venerated Father Columba, and of his successors; among whom were men, whose holiness had been attested by the miracles they performed. To this the presbyter Wilfrid, who spoke in the name of the opposite party, replied, that miracles by themselves considered, afforded no evidence of truth or holiness; for our Lord himself had said, that many, who had performed wonderful works in his name, would not be acknowledged by him as his. Yet it was far from his intention, he said, to apply this to their fathers; since it is more reasonable to think good than evil of those about whom we have no knowledge. He believed, therefore, that those servants of God loved Him with fervent piety; but that they had erred through an ignorant simplicity. "Nay—said he—even though *your* Columba, whom if he was a Christian, we will also call *ours*, were a saint and performed miracles,—is he entitled therefore to be preferred to St. Peter, whom our Lord called the Rock, on whom He founded the church, and to whom he gave the keys of the kingdom of heaven?"—So mighty a power had the reverence for the church of Peter, the apostle to whose hands were committed the keys to the kingdom of heaven, already become, that this appeal settled the question; for the king was afraid lest, if he resisted the authority of this apostle, he might one day find the gates of heaven shut against him.† Bishop Colmann, who by his fidelity in administering the pastoral office, had, like his predecessors, acquired universal respect, resigned his post; since he was unwilling to give up the usage of the Scottish church. Still more was done to

\* Known by the name of the synodus Pharensis, held at a spot not far distant from the city of York; afterwards called Whitby (white-bay) on the sea-coast.

† The king's language was: *Et ego vobis dico, quia hic est ostiarius ille, cui ego contradicere nolo, sed in quantum novi vel valeo hujus cupio in omnibus obediare statutis, ne forte me adveniente ad foras regni celorum, non sit, qui reserat, averso illo, qui claves tenere probatur.*

introduce the dominion of the Roman church customs into the entire English church, by the influence of the archbishop Theodore of Canterbury,\* a man who eminently contributed to the culture of this people. A native of Tarsus in Cilicia, he was a monk well known for his extensive learning, and at the age of sixty-six was still living at Rome. He came to England in 669, as archbishop of Canterbury, having been consecrated to that office by pope Vitalian. But as the pope could not absolutely trust in a man educated in the oriental church as one who would hold fast to the usages and doctrines of the Roman church, he sent with him the Italian abbot Hadrian, in the capacity of an associate, and in a certain sense overseer. With him Theodore travelled through all England, and settled everything after the form and order of the Roman church. He was the first who was able to carry into effect the rights of primacy over the entire English church, bestowed by the popes on the archbishop of Canterbury; and in the course of his administration of twenty-one years, he succeeded in completely banishing the usages of the Scottish church from England. In accomplishing this, he was also assisted by an ecclesiastical assembly held by him at Heriford (Harford), not far from London, in the year 673.† The influence of the English church operated gradually also in this respect on Scotland and Ireland. But the Britons endeavoured to hold fast their old ecclesiastical forms in connection with their national independence, which, however, became every day contracted to a smaller compass.

As regards Germany, the seeds of Christianity had been planted at a very early period in the portions of this country which formerly belonged to the Roman empire; but when these districts were overrun by barbarous, pagan tribes, these seeds of Christianity were necessarily in part suppressed, and partly falsified, and nearly obliterated by the intermixture of pagan elements. Afterwards, through the connection of these parts with the Frankish empire, and with other tribes of German descent; which had already embraced Christianity, new

\* Bede treats of his life and works in the IV. and V. books of his history of the English church. These accounts are brought together in Mabillon *acta sanctorum ordinis Benedicti Sæc. II.* f. 1031.

† See the acts of this synod in Bede IV. c. 5, and in Wilkins's *Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ*, I. f. 41.

excitements were produced ; but so long as all these efforts were of an isolated character, without being brought into closer connection, or united on fixed ecclesiastical foundations, such individual attempts could avail nothing in stemming the tide of barbarism and devastation.

Among the men who, by the influence of religion, diffused salvation and blessing amidst the devastations occasioned by the migration of nations, Severinus is particularly distinguished. Probably a native of the East,\* he had, in striving after the perfection of the inward life, retired into one of the deserts of the East. But impelled by a divine call, often heard in his own breast, he forsook his solitude and repose, to hasten to the assistance of the much harassed nations of the West, now exposed to all manner of devastation ; and oftentimes, when a longing for the silent life consecrated to meditation stirred once more within him, that voice which bade him remain on the scene of desolation sounded in his soul with a still clearer tone.† He appeared on the banks of the Danube, and settled down among the people of those districts which now belong to Austria and Bavaria. He was residing in the neighbourhood of Passau,‡ during the time when these districts in particular presented a wild scene of desolation during the

\* Respecting his native country nothing certain is known. He himself, in a joking or earnest manner, evaded the questions of those who inquired of him about his origin and place of nativity. To an ecclesiastic who once sought refuge with him, he replied to an inquiry of this sort, at first jokingly--" Why, if you think I am a runaway, then have ready your ransom money, to pay for me in case they require me to be delivered up." Then he added, in a more serious tone: " Yet know, that the God who called you to the priestly office, bade me to dwell among these men, threatened with so many dangers (periclitantibus his hominibus int'resse). By his language he was judged to be a Latin, or, according to another reading, a North-African. He himself sometimes hinted, as if speaking of another person, that by peculiar leadings of the divine providence he had been conducted from a distant country of the East, after escaping many dangers, to this spot. See the letter of Eugippius to the deacon Paschasius, prefixed to the account of his life.

† Quanto solitudinem incolere cupiebat, tanto crebrius revelationibus monebatur, ne praesentiam suam populis denegaret afflictis. Eugippii vita, c. 4.

‡ Other towns mentioned as his place of residence are, *Faviana*, a city which some of the older writers held to be Vienna, though this is disputed by others; *Astura*; *Lauriacum*, perhaps the Austrian town called *Lorch*.

restless period which ensued on the death of Attila, in 453, when nation crowded upon nation, and one place after another was given up to the devastations of fire and sword, and the people, after having been stripped of all their possessions, were dragged off as slaves. By a severely abstemious life, in which he voluntarily subjected himself to deprivations of all sorts, and cheerfully submitted to every inconvenience, he set before the effeminate and enfeebled people among whom he dwelt an example how to bear willingly the evils which *necessity* laid upon them. Though accustomed to a more southern climate, he went about among the people barefoot in the midst of an inclement winter, when the Danube was frozen over, to collect provisions and clothing for those who were exposed to hunger and nakedness by the devastations of war ; to procure, either by contributions of ransom-money or by the powerful influence of his intercession, freedom for the troops of captives who were on the point of being carried into slavery ; to warn the nations of the troubles which hung over them, and to exhort them to timely repentance ; to encourage them to put their trust in God ; to administer, by his earnest and faithful prayers, comfort and relief to the suffering, whether from spiritual or bodily distress ; and to persuade the leaders and generals of the barbarous tribes, who respected his words as a voice from a higher world, to spare the conquered. Hardened as he had rendered himself against every outward impression, easy as he found it to endure every bodily hardship, subduing outward impressions by the force of mind, he was none the less tender in his sympathies for the distresses of others.\* By the force of his example, of his exhortations and rebukes, many hearts were softened, so that from various quarters provisions and clothing were sent to him for distribution among the poor. On such occasions he collected together the oftentimes numerous body of the needy and distressed into a church, and himself divided out to each person his share, according to the estimate he had made of their respective wants. Having first offered a prayer, he began

\* His disciple Eupippius says in regard to this : Quum ipse hebdomadarum continuatis jejuniis minime frangeretur, tamen esurie misericorum se credebat afflictum. Frigus quoque vir Dei tantum in nuditate pauperum sentiebat, si quidem specialiter a Deo perceperat, ut in frigidissima regione mirabili abstinentia castigatus, fortis et alacer permaneret.

the work of distribution with the words, " Praised be the name of the Lord," adding a few words of Christian exhortation.\* Various examples evidence the power which the godlike within him exercised over the minds of men. On one occasion a horde of barbarians had stripped the whole country about the city where he was lodged, carrying away men and cattle; and in this, as in every distress, the unfortunate sufferers went complaining and weeping to Severinus. He asked the Roman commander if he had not an armed force at hand, to put in pursuit of the robbers, and wrest from them their plunder. The commander replied, that he did not consider his little band strong enough to cope with the greater numbers of the enemy; still, if Severinus required it, he would sally forth, relying ~~not~~ on the force of arms, but on the help of his prayers. Severinus bade him go quickly and boldly, in the name of God; for where the Lord mercifully went before, the weak would prove himself to be the strongest; the Lord would fight for them. Only he bound him to promise, that all the barbarians taken captive should be conducted to him unharmed. His words were fulfilled; he caused the fetters to be immediately knocked off from the captives brought into his presence, and having refreshed them with food and drink, sent them away to their robber-companions, bidding them say to the latter, that they must not suffer themselves for the future to be tempted by thirst of pillage to come into this territory, for assuredly they would not escape the divine judgment, since, as they saw, God fights for his servants. His appearance and his words operated with such force on the mind of a leader of the Alemanni, that he was seized in his presence with a violent trembling.†. When all the fortresses in Bavaria, on the banks of the Danube,‡ were threatened by attacks of the barbarians, the inhabitants requested Severinus to reside among them by turns, since they considered his presence to be their best protection. § The

\* Eugippius (c. 28) speaks of an example where Severinus succeeded in obtaining through some merchants a supply of oil, a means of sustenance which had become extremely scarce in these districts, and risen to a price which placed it beyond the reach of the poor.\*

† L. c. c. 19. ut tremere coram eo vehementius coepit, sed et postea suis exercitibus indicavit, nunquam se nec re bellicia nec aliqua formidine tanto tremore fuisse concussum.

‡ In the Noricum Ripense.

§ L. c. c. 11.

remarkable success which seemed to be given in answer to his faithful prayers, the effect of that impression of the godlike which many experienced in his presence, procured for him the fame of a ~~worker~~ of miracles. He himself knew how to appreciate such occurrences at their just value in relation to the progress of the kingdom of God, at that juncture, among the severely tried and untutored nations. "Such things now happen," said he, "in many places and among many tribes, in order that it may be seen that there is one God who does wonderful works in heaven and on earth;" and when men were seeking for great results from the efficacy of his prayers, he was wont to say: "Why require great things from small? I know myself to be a man altogether unworthy. It is enough for me if I can but obtain the forgiveness of my own sins!"\* Sometimes, when requested to use his intercessions for temporal favours, he directed the petitioners to look rather at their spiritual needs. Thus, to a monk from one of the rude tribes, who requested him to pray that he might be relieved of a weakness in the eyes, he said, "Pray rather, that the eye within thee may be purged." When invited to undertake the charge of a bishopric, he declined it, saying, it was enough for him that he had renounced his beloved solitude, and visited these countries in obedience to a divine call, to share in the troubles of the afflicted nations. †

After such a hero of faith had thus laboured, from twenty to thirty years, in the midst of these tribes, many a trace of the impression which he had produced among them would doubtless be left behind him; and in fact, even on those populations whose residence in these districts was but transient, an impression was made by him which they never lost. † Many

\* L. c. c. 14.

† L. c. c. 9. The life of Severinus by his disciple Eugippius, abbot of a monastery in the Neapolitan territory, in the *Actis sanctorum* of the Bollandists. *Mens. Januar. T. I. f. 483.*

† Among those who felt the influence of Severinus was Odoacer, sprung from the race of the Rugians, afterwards, as chieftain of the Herulians, founder of an empire in Italy. While a young man, and holding as yet no important rank among the barbarians, he is said to have fallen in company with Severinus, when the latter foretold to him his future greatness. When possessed of his later power he still held a word from Severinus in the highest respect. In Italy Odoacer met with another man who, amid the horrible disorders of those times, laboured with self

devout men, who in the sixth and seventh centuries retreated from the wild scenes of confusion in the Frankish empire, to live as hermits in the countries on the Rhine, acquired the respect of the tribes which had settled down there by their pious lives, or by outward proof of having obtained the mastery over their sensual nature; or, travelling about, they gained the confidence of the people by kindly actions, and hospitably sharing with them the harvested fruits of their labours. The impression produced by their devout lives and their intellectual superiority over the untaught people, gained for them the reputation of possessing miraculous powers, and they might take advantage of this personal respect and love, to pave the way for the entrance of Christianity into ~~the~~ minds. To this number belongs *Gaur*, near the close of the sixth century, who fixed his position on the spot where afterwards the city which goes by his name transmitted his memory to future times: and *Wulflach*, or *Wulf*, an ecclesiastic of Longobardian origin, who in the last half of the sixth century established himself as a stylte in the district of Triers, drew the admiration of the people for whose conversion he prayed, preached to the multitude that thronged around him, and succeeded in persuading them to destroy their idols.\*

The useful labours of these Frankish hermits were far outdone, however, by the activity of the missionaries from Ireland, who exerted themselves in reclaiming and tilling the soil, founding monasteries from which proceeded the conversion and culture of the people, and providing for the education of the youth. For the establishment of the earliest missions among the nations of Germany, the monks that went out from England, and first of all from Ireland, are entitled to the chief merit. The monasteries of Ireland were full ~~of~~ overflowing. Pious monks felt themselves called to ~~more~~ active labours in the service of religion, for which they found no sufficient field in their own country: while at the same time, the native love of foreign travel, peculiar to the Irish people,† would serve as a means of conveying Christianity

denying, ardent love for the good of mankind. This was Epiphanius bishop of Ticinum (Pavia). His intercessions acquired for him great influence with this prince. See his life by Exnodius in Sirmond. opp. T. I. \* See Gregor. Tur. Hist. Franc. l. VIII. c. 15.

† *Natio Scotorum, quibus consuetudo peregrinandi jam paene in natu-*

and civilization to the distant nations. It was natural that the attention of those who by the love of adventure, by the spirit of enterprise, or the ardour of Christian zeal, had been induced to leave their native country, would be directed to the vast uncultivated regions now occupied by numerous barbarian tribes, who were as yet wholly ignorant of Christianity, or among whom the first elements which had once been communicated had become wholly lost by the prevalence of barbarism. Thus, whole colonies of monks, under the guidance of solid, judicious men as their abbots, emigrated into these parts.\*

Columban, near the end of the sixth century, set the first example of this kind, which stimulated numbers, in the seventh, to follow his steps. Born in the Irish province of Leinster (a terra Lagenorum), he had, from early youth, been educated in the famous monastery of Bangor, founded and governed by the abbot Conigall. At the age of thirty, he felt himself impelled to engage in an independent and more extensive field of activity, to preach the gospel to the pagan nations of whom some knowledge had been obtained through the medium of France. He felt within him, as the author of his biography expresses it, that fire which our Saviour says he came to kindle on the earth.† His abbot gave him twelve young men as his companions, who were to assist him in his labours, and to be trained under his spiritual guidance. About the year 590, he crossed over with these to the Frankish kingdom; probably with the intention of preaching the gospel to the tribes dwelling on the borders of that empire.‡ But having been entreated to take up his residence within the Frankish empire itself, and finding that so much still remained to be

ram conversa est. Vita S. Galli I. II. s. 47. Pertz monumenta hist. germ. T. II. f. 30.

\* Alcuin says (ep. 221), "Antiquo tempore doctissimi solebant magistri de Hibernia Britanniā, Galliam, Italiam venire et multos per ecclesias Christi fecisse profectus."

† The words of the monk Jonas, of the monastery of Bobbio near Pavia, in Mabillo's Acta S. O. B. Sac. II. p. 9, are, *ignitum igne Domini desiderium, de quo igne Dominus loquitur: ignem veni mittere in terram.*

‡ He says himself, in his fourth letter to his students and monks, s. 4. Galland. bibl. patr. T. XII. : "mei voti fuit, gentes visitare et evangelium iis a nobis praedicari."

## COLUMBAN.

done in that region for the Christian culture of the vast masses of untaught barbarians, he complied with this invitation. He purposely sought after a spot on which to establish himself in the savage wilderness, which must first be reclaimed and rendered cultivable by the severe labours of his monks, in order that, by the difficulties they must overcome, the monks might gain a greater power of self-denial and control over their sensuous nature, and that an example which would excite imitation might be given to the untutored people, of tilling the soil, the condition of all social improvement. The needful care to supply themselves with the means of living, compelled them to extraordinary exertions, in order to render the soil fruitful, from the products of which, as well as ~~fish~~ fishing, they were to derive their sustenance; and without the invincible faith of the man who directed the whole, and whom all implicitly obeyed, they would inevitably have sunk under the difficulties they encountered. When Columban first settled down with his associates in a forest of the Vosges, upon the ruins of an ancient castle, called Anagratæs (Anegrey), they were so destitute of the means of living as to be obliged to sustain themselves for several days on herbs and the bark of trees. But while he kept his monks steadily employed in the most active labours, he relied, where human means failed, on the providence of God, to whom he prayed in an unwavering confidence of being heard; and the way in which he was delivered from the most extreme distress by an unforeseen concurrence of circumstances, strengthened the confidence of his companions, and caused him to be regarded by the people as a man extraordinarily favoured of God. Once he was visited by a neighbouring priest, and with him went to ~~take~~ a look of the store of grain laid up for the use of the monastery. The visitor expressed his surprise that so small a store should suffice for the wants of so many; whereupon Columban replied: "Let men but rightly serve their Creator, and they are already exempted from the danger of starvation, as it is written in the thirty-seventh Psalm: I have never seen the righteous forsaken, nor his seed begging bread. It is easy for that God to replenish the barrel with meal, who with five loaves of bread satisfied the five thousand." In proportion as severity of discipline, and the sense for spiritual things had abated among the monks and clergy of the Gallic church;

particularly in proportion as the old form of monastic life, which corresponded to the rule of Benedict, had gone into oblivion, in the same proportion the new mode of life exhibited by Columban excited attention and interest, and a new enthusiasm for monasticism was spread through all France. Families of every rank committed their sons to him for education; and he was obliged to distribute his numerous monks in three several monasteries, Anegrey already mentioned, Luxeuil (Luxuvium) in Franche comté, and Fontenay (Fontanae).

Columban's rule was altogether adapted to keep the monks at severe labour, and to inure them to the hardness and self-mastery requisite in order to hold out in this contest with a savage nature, and to overcome so great difficulties. He required of every monk "that he should retire to his couch weary, that he should be able to take sleep while travelling, and that he should be forced to awake before his sleep was quite over." Though he prescribed for his monks a rigidly abstemious life, yet he forbade an excessive severity tending to waste the body, and to unfit them for the duties to which they were called.\* In this, too, we recognize the spirit of the asceticism peculiar to the Irish monks. By implicit, servile obedience, all self-will was to be mortified; and the severest discipline, extending to every motion of the body and tone of the voice, was to be maintained by bodily punishments which followed closely on each transgression. Yet Columban did not govern by outward force alone. How much, even without this, a single word from one, so honoured, and by the better portion, sincerely beloved as well as feared, could avail, is proved by the following example. He was once summoned from the solitude to which he had retired, by the sad tidings, that sickness of various kinds had so spread among his monks in the monastery of Luxeuil, that barely enough still remained well to take care of the invalids. He hastened to them, and finding them all sick, bid them rouse up and go to work in the granary at threshing out corn. A part of them in whom the words of Columban inspired the

\* C. III. the Rule: "ideo temperandus est ita usus, sicut temperandus est labor, quia hæc est vera discretio, ut possilitas spiritualis protectus cum abstinentia carnem macerante retentetur. Si enim modum abstinentia excesserit, vitium, non virtus erit, virtus enim multa sustinet bona et continet."

confidence that strength for the labour would not be found lacking, went to work. Very soon, however, he said to them, that they should allow a little refreshment to their bodies exhausted by disease. He caused food to be placed before them, and they were well. If the discipline was severe, yet it should also be considered, what a number of rude men, whose powers were to be directed to one end, were here brought together, and how much was required, in order to train and govern so rude a multitude. Although again, he insisted with great rigour on the punctilious observance of all prescribed outward customs, and imposed upon his monks many outward devotional practices, which might easily become mechanical, yet he was far from making the essence of piety to consist in externals. He considered these but as means, and was careful to remind his monks, that everything depended on the temper of the heart.\* Although the monks were kept daily employed in the severest bodily labour, their minds should still not be prostrated under the burden of a task-work urged on by earthly solicitudes, but should constantly rise to the contemplation of divine things, and the hours of each day should be portioned out to prayer, to labour, and to the reading of spiritual works.† Columban himself knew how to unite the contemplative life with great activity in practical business. Occasionally he retired from his convent into the dense forest, bearing on his shoulder a copy of the holy Scriptures, which he wanted to study in the solitude. Especially for the celebration of high festivals, he was accustomed thus to prepare himself in solitude by prayer and meditation. His Rules for the spiritual life (Instructiones variae) evince a deep feeling of Christian piety.‡

\* In the Instructio II. he impresses on their hearts the words of the monk Comgall: *Non simus tanquam sepultra dealbata, de intus nomi foris speciosi ac ornati apparere studeamus, vera enim religio non in corporis, sed in cordis humilitate consistit.* And after having represented charity as the highest thing of all in his Instructio XI. he says: "non est labor dilectio, plus suave est, plus medicale est, plus salubre est cordi dilectio."

† Reg. c. II. quotidie jejunandum est, sicut quotidie orandum est, quotidie laborandum quotidieque est legendum.

‡ In the first he says: *Non longe a nobis manentem querimus Deum, quem intra nos sumere habemus, in nobis quim habitat, quasi anima in corpore, si tamen nos membra sana sumus ejus.*

Columban had many violent contests to endure in the French kingdom. His zeal for moral discipline, and for the restoration of its ancient order and severity to monasticism, must have created for him many enemies in the then degenerate state of the Frankish church, among a set of ecclesiastics, whose whole life, governed by the spirit of this world, stood in too marked a contradiction to such an example. Add to this, that as he was unwilling to give up the peculiar usages he had brought with him from his native land, he thus furnished no small occasion of offence to the sticklers for the letter of the old church tradition, and for uniformity in all things. With a free spirit he asserted his independence in this respect, as well in controversy with the popes Gregory the Great and Boniface the fourth, as with the French bishops. To Gregory the Great he wrote that he ought not to allow himself to be determined in these matters by a false humility ; as he would be if, out of deference to the authority of his predecessor, Leo the Great, he refused to correct that which was false ; for perhaps a living dog might be better than a dead lion (Eccles. 9, 4) ; living saints might improve what had been left unimproved by another and a greater. He adjured pope Boniface IV., by the unity of the Christian fold, to grant himself and his people permission, as strangers in France, to preserve their ancient customs, for they were just the same as if in their own country, since dwelling in the wilderness they followed the principles of their fathers, giving annoyance to no one. He held up to him the example of the bishops Polycarp and Anicetus, who had parted from each other with charity undisturbed, though each of them remained firm by his ancient usages. A Frankish synod having met to deliberate on this matter, in the year 602, he wrote to them that he must express his disapprobation that they did not, in conformity with the ecclesiastical laws, hold these synods oftener, which were so essential to the correction of abuses in the church, while, at the same time, he thanked God that at least the present dispute respecting the celebration of Easter had occasioned the assembling of such a synod once more ; but he expressed the wish that they would also busy themselves with more important things. He called upon them to take care that, as shepherds, they followed the example of the chief shepherd. The voice of the hireling, who may be known because he does not

himself observe the precepts he lays down for others, could not reach the hearts of men. 'Words profited nothing without a corresponding life.' True, he said, the diversity of customs and traditions had greatly disturbed the peace of the church; but, added he, if we only strive in humility to follow the example of our Lord, we shall next acquire the power of mutually loving each other, as true disciples of Christ; with all the heart, and without taking offence at each other's failings. And soon would men come to the knowledge of the true way, if they sought the truth with equal zeal, and none were inclined to borrow too much from self, but each sought his glory only in the Lord. One thing I beg of you, he wrote to them, that since I am the cause of this difference, and I came, for the sake of our common Lord and Saviour, as a stranger into this land, I may be allowed to live silently in these forests, near the bones of our seventeen departed brethren, as I have been permitted to live twelve years among you already, that so, as in duty bound, we may pray for you, as hitherto we have done. May Gaul embrace us all at once, as the kingdom of heaven will embrace us, if we shall be found worthy of it. May God's free grace give us to abhor and renounce the whole world, to love the Lord alone, and long after him with the Father and the Holy Ghost. And, after having requested their prayers for him, he added, we beg of you not to consider us as strangers, for we are all members of one body, whether we be Gauls, Britons, Irish, or of whatever other country. Already, when writing this letter, Columban had reason to apprehend that on account of these disputes he would be driven out of the country; and this letter, in which he reproached the French bishops on account of their worldly lives, was not exactly suited to render them more favourably disposed to him. Circumstances also now occurred which enabled his enemies to accomplish their designs against him. He drew upon himself the hatred of the then powerful but vicious Brunehault, the grandmother of king Thierri II., who ruled over the Burgundian empire, in which lay the three monasteries above mentioned, and which had hitherto chiefly supported him. He came into collision with her policy by decidedly protesting against the unchaste life of that prince, and by exhorting him, in opposition to the designs of Brunehault, to enter into a regular marriage connection.\*

\* Once when Columban came to the monarch's camp, Brunehault

As Columban opposed an unbending will to all the threats and all the favours by which it was endeavoured to change his mind, and refused to abate anything from the rigour of discipline in his monasteries, he was at length, in the year 610, banished from Thierri's kingdom, and was to be conveyed back to Ireland. But no one ventured to carry the order into execution.\* He was now on the point of paying a visit to the Longobards in Italy, for the purpose of founding there a monastery, and of labouring for the dissemination of pure doctrine among the Arians. But, by the invitation of a Frankish king, he was induced to look up a place in his kingdom, from which, as a centre, he might conveniently carry out his plans for the conversion of the bordering tribes. Thus he established himself, with his associates, in the territory of Zurich, near Tuggen on the Limmat, expecting to find here an opportunity of converting the Alemanni or Suevi, who dwelt in this region.† But they drew upon themselves the rage of the pagan people by burning one of their idol-temples, and were obliged to seek safety in flight. Arriving at a castle, named Arbon, near lake Constance, a monument of the Roman dominion, they here fell in with Willimar, a pastor and priest, who was overjoyed to be once more visited in his solitude and desertion by Christian brethren. Entertained by his hospitality for seven days, they

c

caused Thierri's illegitimate children to be presented, that he might give them his blessing; but he declared, they "ought to know that these children of an unlawful bed would not come to the succession in the kingdom, which put her in a great rage.

\* As the author of Columban's life relates (s. 47), the vessel which was to convey him to Ireland, was driven ashore by the waves, and could not for several days be got loose from the strand. This led the ship-master to conclude that Columban's banishment was the cause of his unfortunate voyage, and he refused to take either him or his property on board. And now, from the fear of God's anger, no one was willing to execute against him the decree of banishment. He was left free to go where he pleased, and was venerated still more than before. Yet Columban says in his letter to his monks, s. 7: "Nunc mihi scribenti nuntius supervenit narrans mihi navem parari, qua invitus vehar in meam regionem, sed si fugero, nullus vetat custos, nam hoc videntur velle, ut ego fugiam."

† Agathias, in the last half of the sixth century, Hist. l. I. c. 7. ed. Niebuhr, p. 28, writes that the Alemanni were gradually converted from their idolatry by intercourse with the Franks: *η ταχιδία ήδη θρίλκεται τούς ιμφερεστέρους, οις πολλοῦ δι οἷμας χρόνου καὶ ἀπαστιχησίας.*

#### HIS RESIDENCE AT BREGENZ.

then heard of an \*eligible situation, at no great distance, near the ruins of an ancient castle, called Pregentia (Bregenz), well suited to their purpose on account of the fruitfulness of the country, and the vicinity of a lake abounding with fish. To this spot they repaired ; here they founded a church ; here they supported themselves by cultivating a garden, and by fishing ; they also distributed their fish among the pagan people, and thus gained their confidence and affection. Gallus, a young Irishman, of respectable family, whom Columban had brought up, and who, during his residence in the Frankish kingdom, had acquired a knowledge of the German language, availed himself of this knowledge to preach divine truth to the people. For three years they continued to labour after this manner ; until Columban was driven by the hostile party from this retreat also. He now executed the plan which he had before already resolved upon, and betook himself, in the year 613, to Italy, where he founded, near Pavia, the monastery of Bobbio.

Although the communities now to be found among the Longobards, the Arians, had the strongest reasons for union among themselves, yet the schism which had grown out of the dispute, concerning the three chapters, prevailed here still. For this reason Columban, at the instigation of the Longobardian king himself, wrote a letter to pope Boniface IV., in which, with great freedom, he called upon him to take measures to have this subject submitted to the careful investigation of a synod, the Roman church vindicated from the reproach of heresy,\* and the schism brought to end. It is plain, indeed, that either his residence in France and Italy had operated to modify the views he entertained of his relation to the Roman church, or the influence of the circumstances in which he now found himself placed altered his position to that church, and that he now addressed the pope in a different style from what he would have done in Ireland or Britain. The Roman church he pronounces mistress, and speaks in exalted terms of her authority. Much of this, however, is nothing more than a formal courtesy ; and he would have been very far from

\* The way in which he speaks of it shows how far he was from possessing a correct knowledge of the more ancient doctrinal controversies. He brings together Eutyches and Nestorius as kindred teachers of error.

ascribing anything like infallibility to her decisions, or allowing himself to be governed unconditionally by them. He avows this peculiar respect for the Roman church, on the ground that Peter and Paul had taught in it, and honoured it by their martyrdom, and that their relics were preserved in Rome. But he places the church of Jerusalem in a still higher rank.\* He admonishes the Roman church so to conduct as not to forfeit, by any dispute, the spiritual dignity conferred on her ; for the power would remain with her only so long as the *recta ratio* remained with her. *He* only was the true key-bearer of the kingdom of heaven who by true knowledge opened the door for the worthy, and shut it upon the unworthy. Whoever did the contrary could neither open nor shut. He warns the Roman church against setting up any arrogant claims on the ground that the keys of the kingdom of heaven had been given to St. Peter ; since they could have no force in opposition to the faith of the universal church.† Addressing himself to both parties he says, “Therefore, beloved, be ye one, and seek not to renew old disputes ; but be silent rather, and bury them for ever in oblivion : and if anything is doubtful let it be reserved to the final judgment. But whatever is revealed, and capable of being made a matter of human judgment, on this decide justly, and without respect to persons. Mutually acknowledge one another ; that there may be joy in heaven and on earth, on account of your peace and union. I see not how any Christian can contend with another on the faith ; for whatever the orthodox Christian, who rightly praises the Lord, may say, to that the other must respond Amen, because he has the same faith and the same love. Be ye all, therefore, of the same mind ; that ye may be both one—all Christians.”

As to Gallus, he found himself to his great grief compelled by sickness to let his beloved father Columban proceed on his journey alone. He took his net, and with his boat proceeded

\* s. 10. *Roma orbis terrarum caput est ecclesiarum, salva loci dominice resurrectionis singulari prærogativa.*

† *Vos per hoc forte superciliosum nescio quid præ ceteris vobis majoris auctoritatis ac in divinis rebus potestatis vindicatis, noveritis minorem fore potestatem vestram apud Dominum, si vel cogitatur hoc in cordibus vestris, quia unitas fidei in toto orbe unitatem fecit potestatis et prærogativæ, ita ut libertas veritati ubique ab omnibus detur et adiutus errori ab omnibus similiter abnegetur, quia confessio recta etiam sancto privilegium dedit claviculario communis omnium.*

by the lake of Constance to the priest Willimar, by whom they had before been hospitably entertained, where he met with the same friendly reception again. Willimar gave the sick man in charge to two of his clergy. No sooner had Gallus recovered, than he begged the deacon Miltibad, who was best acquainted with the paths in the surrounding country, as it was his business, by hunting and fishing, to provide for the wants of his companions, to conduct him into the vast forest near by, that he might there look out some suitable spot for a hermitage. But the deacon described to him the great danger to which he would be exposed, the forest being full of wolves, bears, and wild boars. Said Gallus, "If God be for us, who can be against us? The God who delivered Daniel out of the lion's den, is able to defend me from the fangs of the wild beasts." He prepared himself, by spending a day in prayer and fasting, for the perilous expedition, and with prayer he set out on his journey the next day, accompanied by the deacon. They travelled on till the third hour after noon, when the deacon invited him to sit down with himself, and refresh themselves with food, for they had taken with them bread, and a net to catch fish in the well watered forest. But Gallus said he would taste of nothing until a place of rest had been shown him. They continued their pilgrimage until sundown; when they came to a spot where the river Steinach, precipitating itself from a mountain, had hollowed out a rock, and where plenty of fish were seen swimming in the stream. They caught several in their net. The deacon struck up a fire with a flint, and they prepared themselves a supper. When Gallus, before they sat down to eat, was about to kneel in prayer, he was caught by a thorn-bush, and fell prostrate to the earth. The deacon ran to his assistance; but said Gallus, "Let me alone, here is my resting-place for ever; here will I abide." And after he had risen from prayer, he made a cross out of a hazel-rod, from which he suspended a capsule of relics. On this spot Gallus now laid the foundation of a monastery, which led to the clearing up of the forest, and the conversion of the land into cultivable soil, and which afterwards became so celebrated under his name, St. Gall. Some years after this foundation, in 615, the vacant bishopric of Costnitz was offered to Gallus; but he declined it, and procured that the choice should fall upon a native of the country,

a certain deacon Johannes, who had been trained under his own direction. The consecration of the new bishop to his office drew together a large concourse of people of every rank, and the abbot Gallus availed himself of this opportunity to bring home to the hearts of the still ignorant people, who had but recently been converted from paganism, a word of exhortation suited to their case. He himself delivered in the Latin language what his disciple interpreted to the people in the dialect of the country.\* After having described in this discourse the history of God's providence, for the salvation of mankind, from the fall downwards, he concluded with these words: "We who are thus the unworthy ministers of this message to the present times, adjure you, in Christ's name, that as ye have once, at your baptism, renounced the devil, all his works and all his ways, so ye would renounce all these through your whole life, and live as becometh children of God;" and he proceeded to designate, by name, the sins which they should especially strive to shun. Having then alluded to the judgment of God, in time and in eternity, he ended with the blessing,—" May the Almighty God, who wills that all men should be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth, and who through the ministry of my tongue has communicated this to your ears—may he himself by his own grace cause it to bring forth fruit in your hearts!" Thus Gallus laboured for the salvation of the Swiss and Swabian populations dwelling around him till the year 640.† A short time before his death, he had requested his old friend the priest Willimar, to meet him at the castle of Arbon. Feeble as he was, he summoned his last energies, and preached there to the assembled people. Sickness prevented him from returning back to his monastery, and he died at this place.‡

He left behind him disciples who laboured on, after his ex-

\* The sermon is to be found among others in Galland. *Bibl. patr.* T. XII.

† The oldest, simplest account of the life of Gallus, written in a Latin which is often scarcely intelligible, is to be found in the latest collection of the *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum* by Pertz III. The recomposed life by the abbot Walafrid Strabo of the ninth century is in Mabillon, *Acta S. ord. Bened. S. II.*

‡ According to the ancient tradition, ninety-five years old; which certainly cannot be correct, as he accompanied Columban from Ireland when he was a young man.

ample, for the culture of the people and of the country, and founded monasteries, from which proceeded the reclaiming of the wilderness. Among these may be mentioned particularly Magnoald (Magold, or abbreviated Magnus), who had probably while a youth joined Gallus at the castle of Arbon, and was of German descent. He founded the monastery at Füssen (Faucense monasterium), on the Lech, in the department of the Upper Danube; and this marks the theatre of his labours.\* We may observe in most cases, that these men reached a good old age,—a consequence of their simple mode of life, and a kind of activity, which with all its toils strengthened their physical powers. In a length of life which seldom fell short of seventy years, they were enabled to extend and confirm the work of their hands in a proportionate degree. The number of individuals who thus passed over from Ireland to France was undoubtedly great; and the names of many of them are unknown to us. Of very few indeed have we any exact information. Soon after the death of Gallus, Fridolin, a monk, came over from Ireland. He laboured among the people on the borders of Alsace, Switzerland, and Suabia, and founded a monastery near Sackingen, on the Rhine.† There came also from Ireland, soon after the death of Gallus, the monk Thrudpert; ‡ he went to Breisgau, in the Black Forest, and would have founded there a monastery; but some of the people, whom a prince of that country favourable to his plan sent with him to assist in subduing the wilderness, are said to have murdered him. A monastery, called after his name, St. Hubrecht, perpetuated his memory.§

Another Irish monk, by the name of Cyllena (Cilian), appeared in the last half of the seventh century as a preacher in a part of the Frankish territory, where probably, at an earlier period, when it belonged to the Thuringian dominion, some seeds of Christianity had been scattered.|| He is said to

\* The account of his life (unfortunately of very uncertain authority), written at a later period, is to be found in the *Actis sanctorum*, at the VI. of September.

† The uncertain accounts of his life, at the VI. of March.

‡ It is singular, that the names of the two last sound more like German than Irish: yet they may have been early altered by a foreign pronunciation.

§ See *Acta*, p. 26. April.

|| We are in want of ancient and trustworthy accounts of the life of

have found in the command of Christ, To forsake all and follow him, a call expressly addressed to himself, and bidding him to engage in the work of a missionary. He set out on his journey with several companions, and came to Würzburg, where he fell in with a certain duke Gozbert, who was baptized by him, and whose example was followed by many of his people. But this person afterwards contracted a marriage with Geilane, his brother's widow, thus violating laws of the church; Cilian, believing him to have arrived at sufficient maturity of Christian knowledge to know better, upbraided him with this as a crime. He resolved to separate from her—but Geilane, being informed of his intention, took advantage of the absence of her husband in a time of war, and caused Cilian to be put to death. If the facts were so, we have here an example showing how the missionaries were hampered and thwarted in the discharge of their proper duties, from being no longer able to discriminate between the divine law and human prescriptions.

As it respects the dissemination of Christianity in Bavaria Proper, our sources of information are not sufficiently accurate and certain to enable us to trace the progress of events subsequent to the death of that man of God, Severinus. From the neighbouring fields of missionary labour already mentioned, many seeds of divine truth would find their way here also. It may be supposed that Irish missionaries would not fail to visit so inviting a spot. A Frankish synod, in the year 613, felt itself called to do something for the spread of Christianity, as well as the diffusion of pure Christian knowledge, among the neighbouring populations; and they committed this work to the abbot Eustasius, of Luxeuil, the successor of Columban, and to the monk Agil.\* These persons are said to have extended their travels as far as Bavaria, where they found not only the remains of idolatry, but also certain

this man also; for the older and simpler biographical notices published among those of Canisius (Lect. antiq. T. III.) cannot be so called. What is told in them both, about Cilian's journey to Rome, for the purpose of obtaining full power from the pope to enter upon his missionary labours, certainly does not look exactly like what we might expect from an Irish monk.

\* Called by the French St. Aile, afterwards abbot of the monastery Resbacum, Rébais.

heretical views of Christianity;\* namely, as it is asserted, the errors of Photinus and Bonosus.

As regards the so designated doctrines of Bonosus, it may be conjectured that some Irish missionary had introduced there the opinion, in earlier times not deemed offensive, that Mary had other sons after the birth of Jesus; but it may be questioned whether the reporters of this account had any right notion of the doctrine of Bonosus, or knew how to distinguish it from that of Photinus. At all events, by the latter they meant the denial of Christ's divinity, and the opinion that he was really a man. We might then suppose, either that some among the new converts had framed to themselves such a conception of the Christian doctrine, the rude understanding of the natural man being easily led to form such views of Christ,† or that the ignorance of rude missionaries had given occasion to these opinions, for no sooner had the enthusiasm for missionary labours begun to spread, than it happened that even such as possessed no suitable qualifications were led from the force of imitation, from ambition, or other impure motives,

\* The road to Alsace, on the borders of Switzerland, led them perhaps next still further towards Bavaria: for one object of their journey was the tribe of Waraskians, whose locality, in the life of St. Salaberga, (Mabillon O. B. see. II. f. 425) is thus described: "qui partem Sequanorum provinciarum et Duvii (river Doubs) annis fluentia ex utraque parte incolunt." According to the Life of Eustasius by the monk Jonas, Eustasius went in the first place to the Waraskians, and found such errors prevailing only among this people —among the Bavarians merely idolatry. But according to the Life of Salaberga, Eustasius went first to the Bavarians, and found such errors prevailing first among these. Also, in the Life of Agil (f. 319) their *route* is described in the same manner; but whether these errors were found to prevail also among the Bavarians, is not stated.

† The author of the Life of Salaberga describes the erroneous doctrines most distinctly: "purum hominem dominum nostrum Jesum esse absque Deitate patris." But here also no distinction is made in fact between the doctrine of Photinus and of Bonosus; and as the other narrators say likewise, Photinus vel Bonosus, they too were doubtless aware of no difference.

‡ How possible it is for heretical tendencies to spring up even in the midst of a people in a wholly rude state, when Christianity has made some little progress among them, is seen at present in the remarkable appearances among the islanders of the Pacific Ocean. See the Missionary Operations in the South Sea, by F. Krohn, Hamburg, F. Perthes, 1833, and Missionary Register for 1832, pp. 99 and 365.

to devote themselves to the work.\* It is probable, however, that these errors sprung from some root of false doctrine, which had been propagated among these tribes at a much earlier period; for we find already, at the close of the fifth century, indications of the fact, that along with the Arians, the followers also of these Photinian opinions sought to introduce their doctrines among the Burgundians; whether it was that Arianism itself had called forth a tendency of the natural understanding, which proceeded still further in the denial of our Saviour's peculiar dignity, or that such a sect had from ancient times been secretly propagated in the Roman empire, and now sought to gain among the newly converted people, a place of refuge for itself as well as proselytes to its faith.†

When about the middle of the seventh century, Emmeran, a bishop from Aquitania,‡ made a journey to Hungary, with a view to labour for the conversion of the Avaræ, the Bavarian duke Theodo I., as it is recorded, represented to him that desolating wars rendered his undertaking impracticable, and begged him, instead of pursuing his plan, to remain in Bavaria, where some seeds of Christianity were already to be

\* Thus, e. g. it is related in the life of the abbot Eustasius, that a certain Agrestius, who had been secretary of the Frankish king Thierri II., seized with sudden feelings of contrition, had renounced all his earthly possessions, and withdrawn to retirement in the couvent of Luxeul. Next he was seized with a violent desire to become a missionary; and it was in vain the abbot Eustasius assured him, that he wanted the maturity necessary for that employment. He went among the Bavarians, but tarried there only a short time, as he could effect nothing.

† Sidonius Apollinaris, bishop of Clermont (epp. I. VI. ep. 12. opp. Sirmond I. f. 582), speaks of the pains taken by Patinus, bishop of Lyons, to convert the Photinians among the Burgundian people. It might be supposed, however, that he here confounded the Photinians with the Arians. Yet it is plain, from a letter of Avitus, bishop of Vienne, to the Burgundian king Gundobad, (ep. 28. opp. Sirmond II. f. 44) that persons who denied a pre-existent divine nature of Christ, perhaps proper Photinians, had sought to gain over the king to their opinions. Hence he was led to consult bishop Avitus.

‡ Not even the name of his bishopric is stated in the account of his life first compiled in the eleventh century, which Canisius has published in the third volume\* of his *Lectiones antiqueæ*. The life, in this form, was first composed in the eleventh century; and though an earlier narrative furnishes the basis of it, yet even this does not reach back to the age of Emmeran; and these later compilations are always less trustworthy. A true picture of the labours and fortunes of Emmeran cannot be recovered from these meagre biographies.

found, though mixed up with paganism, and to labour for the restoration of religion to its purity among his people. He laboured there for three years. After this, he undertook a journey to Rome, intending to spend the remainder of his days in the vicinity of places deemed sacred; but, waylaid and murdered by a son of the duke, to revenge an accusation of which he was supposed to be the author, he perished as a martyr.\* At the close of the seventh century, Rudbert (Ruprecht) bishop of Worms, descended from a royal family among the Franks, made a journey to Bavaria at the invitation of duke Theodo II. He begged of the duke that he might be allowed to establish himself in a wild district of country, full of the remains of magnificent structures belonging to the Roman times, where the city of Juvavia lay in ruins. Here he built a church and a monastery, the foundation upon which rose afterwards the bishopric of Salzburg. After this he returned to his native land, to procure further aid for the prosecution of his growing work; and with twelve new missionaries he returned to his old field of action, and laboured afresh in it until at an advanced age, thinking his work established on a sufficiently firm foundation, and having left behind him a successor in the field, he returned back to his bishopric, for the purpose of spending there the remnant of his days.† After these men, followed the Frankish hermit Corbinian, who settled down in the district where afterwards sprung up the bishopric of Freisingen.

Bordering on the kingdom of the Franks was the powerful, barbarous, and warlike tribe of the Frieslanders, who, besides the strip of territory which still bears their name, had possession of several other portions of the Netherlands and of the neighbouring Germany, and partly by reason of their vicinity, partly by the conquest of some portions of the territory, zealous bishops among the Franks found opportunity of extending among this people the sphere of their labours. Among these

\* The cause of the persecution exerted against him still remains in the dark. According to the above-mentioned life, Emmeran, out of compassion to the guilty ones, took upon himself the blame of the pregnancy of a daughter of the duke; and when at some later period he retracted the pious fiction, he was not believed.

† Respecting these missionaries also, we have only a meagre account, drawn up at a much later period. *Canis. Lect. antiqu. T. III. P. II.*

was Amandus, a person of glowing zeal, but who seems to have been wanting in prudence, and wisdom. Having been ordained as a bishop without any fixed diocese (*episcopus regionarius*), he chose the districts of the Schelde, then belonging to the kingdom of the Franks, as his field of labour. He came to the place called Gandavum (Ghent), and here found idolatry prevailing; but he was unable to subdue the barbarism of the people. He procured an order from the Frankish king Dagobert, by which all might be compelled to submit to baptism. In endeavouring to carry this command into execution, and to preach to the people, who as it may well be supposed could derive but little benefit from preaching, backed by such forcible measures, he exposed himself to the most violent persecutions and ill-treatment, and sometimes to the peril of his life. Yet he endeavoured also to win the affections of his hearers by acts of benevolence. He redeemed captives; instructed and baptized them. A great impression was made by him on the minds of the rude people, when on a certain occasion he caused a thief, who had been hung, and whom he had sought in vain, by his intercessions, to deliver from the punishment of death, to be taken down from the gallows after the execution of his sentence, and conveyed to his own chamber, where he succeeded in recalling him to life. As he appeared now in the character of a miracle-worker, many came to him of their own accord and were baptized. They destroyed their idol-temples, and Amandus was assisted by presents of the king and the united offerings of pious men, in the work of converting these temples into monasteries and churches. But now, instead of continuing to build on these first successful issues, and to extend and establish on a still firmer foundation his sphere of action where so much still remained to be done, and a happy beginning had just been made, he allowed himself to be hurried on by a fanatical zeal to seek martyrdom among the savage Selavonians, and directed his course to the countries around the Danube; but finding here no opportunity of doing good, nor even a chance for martyrdom, being received perhaps with indifference or ridicule rather than rage, he soon returned back to his former field of labour. At last, he obtained a fixed diocese, as bishop of Mastricht (Trajectum), and with indefatigable pains, he journeyed through it, exhorting the clergy to the faithful

discharge of their duties, and preaching to the pagan populations who dwelt within, or on the borders of, his diocese, till his death, in 679.\* One of the most distinguished among these Frankish bishops who exerted themselves in the cause of missions, was Eligius.† The story of his life before he became a bishop shows, that amidst all the crudeness of the Frankish people, and in spite of the sensuous colouring of the religious spirit, some remains of vital Christianity were still preserved in old Christian families. From such a family Eligius sprung.‡ Already, while pursuing the occupation of a goldsmith, he had by remarkable skill in his art, as well as by his integrity and trustworthiness, won the particular esteem and confidence of king Clotaire I., and stood high at his court. Even then the cause of the gospel was to him the dearest interest to which everything else was made subservient. While working at his art, he always had a bible lying open before him. The abundant income of his labours he devoted to religious objects and deeds of charity. Whenever he heard of captives—who in these days were often dragged off in troops as slaves—that were to be sold at auction,§ he hastened to the spot and paid down their price. Sometimes, by his means, a hundred at once, men and women, thus obtained their liberty. He then left it to their choice, either to return home, or to remain with him as free Christian brethren, or to become monks. In the first case, he gave them money for their journey; in the last, which pleased him most, he took pains to procure them a handsome reception into some monastery. While a layman, he made use of his Christian knowledge, in which he excelled many of the common clergy, to further the religious instruction of the people. Thus his fame soon spread far and wide, and when strangers from abroad, from Italy or Spain, came on any business to the king, they

\* The source, is the ancient account of his life in the *Actis S. Ord.* Bened. Mabillon. *Sac. II.*

† St. Eloy. His life, written by his disciple Audoen, is better suited than other biographies of this period to give a true and vivid picture of the man it describes. It is found in *D'Achery spicileg. T. II. nov. edit.*

‡ Born at Chatelat, four miles from Limoges, A.D. 588.

§ *Principue e genere Saxonum, qui abunde eo tempore veluti greges a sedibus propriis evulsi in diversa distrahebantur*

first repaired to him for consultation and advice. In the practice of his art, he was most pleased to be employed on objects connected with the interests of religion, consequently in accordance with the peculiar spirit of those times, in adorning with costly shrines the graves of saints.

This person, in 641, was appointed bishop over the extensive diocese of Vermandois, Tournay, and Noyon, the boundaries of which touched on pagan tribes, while its inhabitants were many of them still pagans, or new converts, and Christians only in name. With indefatigable zeal he discharged the duties of this office till 659, through a period of eighteen years. He took every pains to search out the rude populations within the bounds of his extensive diocese, and even beyond them. In these tours of visitation, he had to suffer many insults and persecutions, sometimes exposing his life to danger; but by love, gentleness, and patience, he triumphed over every obstacle. The account which his scholar and biographer gives us of the matter of his discourses, shows that he was very far from attaching importance to a barely external conversion, or mere conformity to the Christian ritual; on the contrary, he endeavoured carefully to put men on their guard against such outward show, and to insist on a Christian change of heart in its whole extent. "It is not enough," said he, "that you have taken upon you the Christian name, if you do not the works of a Christian. The Christian name is profitable to him who constantly treasures Christ's precepts in his heart and expresses them in his life." He reminded his hearers of their baptismal vows, recalled them to the sense of what these vows implied, and of what was requisite in order to fulfil them. He then warned them against particular sins, and exhorted them to various kinds of good works. He taught them that love was the fulfilling of the law, and that the dignity of the children of God consisted in their loving even their enemies for God's sake. He warned them against the remains of pagan superstition. They should not allow themselves to be deluded by auguries, or pretended omens of good or ill fortune;\* but when going on a journey or about to engage in any other business, they should simply cross themselves in the name of Christ, repeat the creed and

\* *Similiter et auguria, vel sternutationes nolite observare, nec in itinere positi aliquas aviculas cantantes attendatis.*

the *Pater noster* with faith and sincere devotion, and no power of the evil one would be able to hurt them. No Christian should care in the least on what day he left his house, or on what day he returned home, for all days alike were made by God. None should bind an amulet on the neck of man or beast, even though the charm were prepared by a priest, though it were said to be a holy thing, and to contain passages of Holy Writ; for there was in it no remedy of Christ, but only a poison of the devil. In everything, men should simply seek to be partakers of the grace of Christ, and to confide, with the whole heart, in the power of his name. They should desire constantly to have Christ in their hearts, and his sign on their foreheads: for the sign of Christ was a great thing, but it profited those only who laboured to fulfil his commandments.

About this period, *Livin*, descended from a respectable Irish family,\* laboured as a missionary among the barbarous people in Brabant; and in 656 he experienced the martyrdom which he had predicted for himself.†

Monks from England must have found in their relationship to the German nations, a peculiar motive for engaging in the work of conveying to these nations the message of salvation; and by means of this relationship such an enterprise would in their case be greatly facilitated. In the last times of the seventh century, many young Englishmen resorted to Ireland, partly for the purpose of leading a silent and strictly spiritual life among the monks of that island, and partly for the sake of gathering up the various knowledge there to be obtained. They were received by the Irish with Christian

\* Boniface, who wrote the life of this person, affirms, it is true, that he received his facts from the mouth of three of Livin's disciples; but still his narrative is entitled to little confidence, and cannot be safely used. Livin is said to have received baptism from Augustin, the founder of the English church; but to judge from the relations in which he stood to the British church, this certainly is not probable.

† His poetical letter to the abbot Florbert in Ghent:

Impia barbarico gens exagitata tumultu  
Hic Brabantum furi meique cruentia petit.  
Quid tibi peccavi qui peius nuntia porto?  
Pax est, quod porto, cur mihi bella moves?  
Sed quia tu spiras, feritas, soris leta triumphi,  
Atque dabit paluum gloria martyri.  
Cui credam novi, nec spe frustrabor inani,  
Qui spondet Deus est, quis dubitare potest?

hospitality, and provided not only with the means of subsistence, but with books. Among these, was one by the name of Egbert, who in a sickness which threatened to prove fatal, made a vow, that if God spared his life, he would not return to his native land, but devote his days to the service of the Lord in some foreign country. He afterwards decided, with several companions, to repair to the German tribes; but when on the point of embarking with them, was detained behind.\* His companions, however, carried their resolution into effect; and thus it was he that really gave the first impulse to the work, which subsequently placed the German church on a stable foundation. The principal among these was the monk *Wigbert*. He resided for two years among the Frieslanders, who at that time still maintained their independence; but owing to the rude temper of the people and of their king Radbod, he met with too determined a resistance, and returned, without accomplishing anything, to his native land. But the work was resumed with better success by another person from England, the presbyter *Willibrord*. A pious education had early lighted up in him the fire of divine love. At the age of twenty, he too visited Ireland, for the purpose of being trained; and after having spent there twelve years,† he felt an impulse constraining him to live no longer simply for his own improvement, but to labour also for the good of others; and the fane of the nations of German descent, the Frieslanders, the Saxons, where the field of labour was so great, and the labourers so few, strongly attracted him. Pipin, mayor of the palace, having subdued the Frieslanders, and made a part of them dependent on the Frankish empire, new and more favourable prospects were thus opened for a mission into these countries. He set out with twelve associates, and others followed after. Among these were two brothers by the name of Heuwald, who died as martyrs among the Saxons. Willibrord having been invited by Pipin to fix the seat of his labours in the northern parts of his kingdom, first visited Rome, in the year 692, yielding to that respect for the Roman church which was so deeply impressed on the English mind. His object was to begin the great work under the authority of the pope, and to

\* Bede III. 27; V. 11, 12.

† See Alcuin's Life of Willibrord.

provide himself with relics for the consecration of the new churches. Meantime his associates were not inactive. They got one of their own number, a gentle spirit, Svidbert by name, to be ordained as bishop, and he laboured among the Westphalian tribe of the Boruchtuarians, but by an irruption of the Saxons was driven away; whereupon Pipin made over to him the island of Kaiserwörth, in the Rhine, for the foundation of a monastery.

Willibrord soon returned from Rome, and began his labours, with flattering results, in Frankish Friesland. Pipin now concluded to give the new church a fixed and permanent form, by erecting a bishopric which should have its seat in the old borough of the Wilts (Wilteburg, the Roman Trajectum, Utrecht), and for this purpose sent Willibrord to Rome, to receive ordination from the pope as an independent bishop over the new church. Thus his church was to obtain the dignity of a metropolis, or an archbishopric. The fame of Willibrord's labours in these districts is said to have induced *Wulfram*, a bishop of Sens, to repair thither with several companions. He went to those Frieslanders who were not yet subjected to the Frankish dominion, and is said to have baptized many. A characteristic incident is related of his labours, which, though the account of his life cannot be relied on as authentic, may nevertheless be true. King Radbod came and represented himself as prepared to receive baptism, but was first desirous of having one question answered; namely, whether on arriving at heaven, he should find there his forefathers also, the earlier kings. The bishop replied, that these, having died without baptism, had assuredly been condemned to hell. "What business have I, then," said Radbod, "with a few poor people in heaven; I prefer to abide by the religion of my fathers." Though the barbarous Radbod was, doubtless, only seeking a pretext to reject, in a half bantering way, the proposal that he should embrace Christianity, still this incident may serve to illustrate how the spread of Christianity was hindered and checked by the narrow and tangled views of its doctrines which had grown out of the ordinances of the church. Alike fruitless were all the pains bestowed by Willibrord on the king of the Frieslanders. The active missionary made a journey, however, to the north, beyond the province of Radbod, as far as Denmark. Yet all

that he could do here was to purchase thirty of the native youths. These he instructed as he travelled ; and having at length landed on a certain island consecrated to the ancient German deity Fosite (Fosite's land, Helgoland) he meant to avail himself of some opportunity while he remained there, to baptize them. But to touch anything consecrated to the god on this holy island, was considered a capital crime. When Willibrord therefore ventured to baptize the lads in a sacred fountain, while his associates slaughtered some animals deemed sacred, the fury of the people was greatly excited. One of the missionaries, selected by lot, was sacrificed to the idols ; the rest king Radbod sent back to the Frankish kingdom. Somewhat later, Willibrord was enabled to extend the field of his labours among this people. It was when the Frieslanders were more completely subjected to the Frankish dominion, and after the death of king Radbod, the most violent opposer of the Christian church. This happened in 719. At a still later period, he was assisted in no inconsiderable degree by one of the natives, a man of high standing, and a zealous Christian. In him, while yet a heathen, we have a remarkable instance of that drawing of the heavenly Father, which leads those who follow it to the Son ; for even then he strove to follow the law of God written on the heart. He was a benefactor to the poor, a defender of the oppressed, and as a judge exercised justice ; but in fearlessly administering the law, and setting his face against all the wrong done by king Radbod and his servants, he drew upon himself the persecutions of that prince, and was compelled to escape, with his family, to the neighbouring kingdom of the Franks. Here he met with a friendly reception ; here, too, he became acquainted with the Christian doctrines, was convinced of their truth, and went over, with his whole family, to the Christian church. After the death of king Radbod, Charles Martel, the mayor of the palace, presented him with a feof on the borders of Friesland, and sent him back to his native country, to labour there for the promotion of the Christian faith. He established himself in the vicinity of Utrecht, and with his whole family, zealously maintained the preaching of the faith.\* Thus Willibrord laboured for more than thirty years

\* See Altfrid's Life of St. Liudger, near the beginning: *Monumenta Germaniae historica*, by Pertz, T. II. f. 405.

as bishop of the new church. In 739, at the age of eighty-one, he died.\*

But notwithstanding the individual efforts which had thus far been made, on so many different sides, for the introduction of Christianity into Germany, still these isolated and scattered attempts, without a common centre, or a firm ecclesiastical bond to unite the individual plans in one concerted whole, could accomplish but little which was calculated to endure, amid such a mass of untutored nations, and under circumstances in so many respects unfavourable. To insure the steady progress of Christianity among these populations for all future time, one of two things was necessary. Either a large number of missionaries labouring singly, and relying simply *on the power of the divine word lodged in the hearts of men*, would have to be distributed through a large number of smaller fields, and to prepare the way so that the Christian church might *gradually* and by *working outwards from within*, attain among the nations a fixed and determinate shape, and Christianity, like a leaven, penetrate through the whole mass of the people - and this was the end to which the efforts of the Irish and British missionaries chiefly tended; or, some one individual must rise up, endowed with great energy and wisdom, to conduct the whole enterprise after *one* plan, who would be able, in a much shorter space of time, to found a universal German church after some determinate outward form, and to secure its perpetuity by forced outward institutions knit in close connection with the great body of the Roman church. The latter was done; and it was the work of Boniface, whom, for this reason, though he found already many scattered missionaries in Germany, we must still regard as the father both of the German church and of Christian civilization in Germany.

Winfried, as he was properly named,† was born in Kirton, Devonshire, in the year 680. He belonged, as it seems, to a

\* Bede says of him, A.D. 731: *Ipse adhuc superest, longa jam venerabilis aetate, utpote tricesimum et sextum in episcopatu habens annum et post multiplieas militiae celestis agones ad premia remuneratiois supernae tota mente suspirans.*

† The name *Bonifacius*, by which he was commonly known after his ordination as a bishop, he had perhaps adopted already on his entrance into the convent.

family of some consideration, and was destined by his father for a secular profession. But by the discourses of the clergy, who, according to an old English custom,\* were used to visit the families of the laity for the purpose of instructing them in the faith and advancing their progress in the Christian life, the heart of the youth, peculiarly susceptible to religious impressions, was inflamed with a passion for the monastic life; and his father, who was at first opposed, rendered humble and pliant by a reverse of fortune, was finally induced to yield to his wishes. In two considerable English convents, at Adscancester (Exeter) and Nutescelle, he received his clerical education and theological training. The predominant bent of his mind was practical. By prudence and skill in the management of affairs, he must have early distinguished himself: hence he was employed by his convent as their chosen agent in all difficult cases. But the passion for foreign travel, which seemed innate in the monks of these islands, together with a loftier wish of devoting his life to labours for promoting the salvation of pagan nations,† constrained him to form the resolution of leaving his native land. In 715 he set out on his voyage to Friesland; yet the consequences of the war, then unfortunate for the French kingdom, between the Major domo Charles Martel and the Friesland king Radbod, proved a hindrance to his labours, and he was therefore induced, after having spent a whole summer and a part of the autumn in Utrecht, to return back to his convent. The monks of his cloister were now ready and anxious to make him their abbot, the office having just become vacant; but he could not be induced to abandon the missionary work, which was so dear to his heart, and, following the example of the older English missionaries, he first visited Rome in the autumn of the year 718, when pope Gregory II., to whom he had been recommended by his wise friend Daniel, bishop of Winchester, commissioned

\* This, in truth, was a kind of duty to which the English missionaries were earnestly devoted from the very first, see above p. 27, 30. In the life of Boniface by his scholar, the presbyter Willibald, in Pertz, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, T. H. c. 1. p. 334, it is said: "Cum vero aliqui, sicut illis in regionibus moris est, presbyteri sive clerici populares vel laicos prædicandi causa adiissent."

† He himself says, in a letter to an English abbess: "Postquam nos timor Christi et amor peregrinationis longa et lata terrarum ac maris intercapidine separavit." ep. 31.

him to preach the gospel to the pagan nations of Germany. He now made his first essay in Thuringia, to which, at that time, a large portion of the French territory belonged; but the information which he obtained there convinced him that, to accomplish the ends he had in view, it would be necessary for him to secure the co-operation of the French government, and he repaired for this purpose to Charles Martel, the mayor of the palace. The favourable prospects which began to open on the mission to Friesland by the death of Radbod, in 719, induced him to visit that country, and he acted under the archbishop Willibord for three years with encouraging success. The latter, in his advanced age, was desirous of securing him as his successor; but Boniface thought it his duty to decline this offer, feeling himself impelled by an inward call from above to secure the spread of the gospel among the nations of Germany, whose sad condition was known to him by actual observation. This thought so occupied his mind as to present itself in the shape of a dream,\* in which he heard the divine call, and saw opened to his view the sure prospect of an abundant harvest among the pagan nations of Germany. In obedience to this call, he journeyed, in 722, to Hessa and Thuringia. At Amoeneburg, in Upper Hessa; he baptized two princes of the country, Detwig and Dierolf, and there he founded the first monastery. In Thuringia, a country exposed, by wars with the bordering Saxons, to constant devastations, he had to sustain many dangers and hardships, with great difficulty obtaining a scanty supply for his own wants and those of his companions.† Having repaired the

\* I take this anecdote from a letter of the abbess Bugga to Boniface, who at that time was still a presbyter, ep. III. In praising the divine mercy, which had been shown to him in so many ways, te transeuntem per ignotos pagos piissime conduxit, she adds: *Primum pontificem gloriosae sedis ad desiderium mentis tuae blandiendum inclinavit, postea inimicum catholicam ecclesie Rathbodum coram te cousternavit, demum per somnia semetipso revelarit, quod debuisti manifeste messem Dei metere et congregare sanctarum animarum manipulos in horreum regis celestis.* The series of events here described harmonises entirely with the chronology of Boniface's life, as cleared up from other sources. First his journey to Rome and the acquiescence of the pope in his missionary enterprises; next, the event so fortunate for the mission among the Frieslanders, the death of Radbod; then the inward call of God to labour among the pagan tribes of Germany, confirmed by a vision.

† See Liudger's life of abbot Gregory of Utrecht, s. 6.

results of his labours thus far to the pope, he was called by the latter to Rome, which, in obedience to this call, he visited again in the year 723. Pope Gregory II. had it in view to consecrate him as bishop over the new church ; but he wished in the first place, after the usual manner, to make sure of his orthodoxy, and for this purpose required him to repeat his confession of faith. Partly because he was ignorant of the Roman mode of pronouncing Latin, partly because he distrusted his ability to find suitable expressions at once for doctrinal matter in an oral discourse,\* he begged to be allowed the privilege of presenting to the pope a written confession, which was granted him. The pope being satisfied with this confession, and with the manner in which he had acquitted himself in reporting his labours thus far, solemnly ordained him as bishop over the new church to be founded in Germany,† without assigning, of course, for the present, a special diocese.‡ His labours were to be confined to no one place ; but he was to travel round among the tribes, and to spend the most of his time wherever necessity might require. § At this ordination Boniface bound himself by an oath to ecclesiastical obedience to the pope, similar to that usually taken by the Italian bishops belonging to the several patriarchal dioceses of the Roman

\* "This is probably the meaning of Boniface's words : "Novi me imperitum iam peregrinus," (after he had spent so long a time among the wild populations, and was used to speak only in the German tongue,) l. c. n Pertz, p. 342. Hence it is next said also of written confessions of faith : *Fidem urbanae eloquentiae scientia conscriptam.*

† Yet Boniface seems by no means to have been resolved from the first to pass the whole of his life in Germany ; and hence he could not have entertained the design of becoming the head of a new church ; for it was his purpose, some time or other, to return to his native land, as is evident from his IV. letter, ed. Würdtwein, in which, exhorting a friend in England to the diligent study of the sacred scriptures, he says to him : *Si dominus voluerit, ut aliquando ad istas partes remcans, sicut propositum habeo, per viam (it should doubtless read vitam) spondeo, me tibi in his omnibus fore fidelem amicum et in studio divinarum scripturarum, n quantum vires suppeditent, devotissimum adjutorem.*

‡ A so-called *episcopus regionarius.*

§ As late as the year 739, Gregory III. wrote to him : "Nec enim habebis licentiam, frater, pro incepti laboris utilitate in uno morari loco, sed confirmatis cordibus fratrum et omnium fidelium qui rarescunt in illis Hesperiis partibus, ubi tibi dominus aperuerit viam salutis, prædicare non deseras."

church,\* but with such modifications as the difference between the relations of an Italian bishop and of a bishop of the new German church required. At the tomb of the Apostle Peter he took the oath, which in substance was as follows:—"I promise thee, the first of the Apostles, and thy representative pope Gregory, and his successors, that, with God's help, I will abide in the unity of the Catholic faith, that I will in no manner agree with anything contrary to the unity of the Catholic church, but will in every way maintain my faith pure and my co-operation constantly for thee, and for the benefit of thy church, on which was bestowed, by God, the power to bind and to loose, and for thy representative aforesaid, and his successors. And whenever I find that the conduct of the presiding officers of churches contradicts the ancient decrees and ordinances of the fathers, I will have no fellowship or connection with them; but, on the contrary, if I can hinder them, I will hinder them; and if not, report them faithfully to the pope."†

This formal oath was of the greater moment in its influence on the formation of the New German church, inasmuch as Boniface—such was the integrity of his character—would be most conscientious in observing its provisions. The question was now settled, whether the German church should be incorporated into the old system of the Roman hierarchy, and the entire Christian culture of the West be determined by this; or whether, from this time onward, there should go forth from the German church a reaction of free Christian development. The last would have taken place, if the more free-minded

\* The form of an oath of this sort is still preserved in the business-diary of the popes, belonging to the first part of the eighth century, the *Liber diuinus Romanorum pontificum*, published by the Jesuit Garnier at Paris 1680, and to be found in C. G. Hoffmann *nova scriptorum ac monumentorum collectio*, T. II. Lips. 1733.

† This latter passage was calculated especially with reference to the circumstances under which Boniface was to labour; and in the present case the references in the original oath, which might suit the old relations of the pope to the Byzantine empire, were altered for the occasion. In the latter, it ran thus: *I promitto pariter, quod si quid contra rem publicam vel piissimum principem nostrum a quolibet agi cognovero, minime consentire; sed in quantum virtus suffragaverit, obtemperare et vicario tuo, domino meo apostolico, medis, quibus potuero, nuntiare et id agere vel facere, quatenus fidem meam in omnibus sincerissimam habeam.*

British and Irish missionaries, who were scattered among the German populations, had succeeded in gaining the preponderance. At Rome, the danger which threatened from this quarter was well understood; and the formal oath prescribed to Boniface was doubtless expressly intended for the purpose of warding off this danger, and of making Boniface an instrument of the Roman church system for suppressing the freer institutions which sprung from the British and the Irish churches. The purpose of his mission was not barely to convert the pagans, but quite as much also to bring back those whom the heretics had led astray, to orthodoxy, and to obedience to the Roman church.\* And it is singular to remark, that the church from which the Christian spirit that was to burst the chains of the Roman church system was destined to proceed, was even in its first beginnings on the point of taking this same direction.

Now, although the missionaries, whom Gregory was bound to oppose were his superiors in Christian knowledge and in clerical training, yet it may be questioned whether they so exactly understood the condition and the wants of the rude

\* In an old report, the object of Boniface's mission is thus described: *ut ultra Alpes pergeret et in illis partibus, ubi hæresis maxime pullularet, sua salubri doctrina funditus can eradicaret.* S. acta S. Mens. Jun. T. I. f. 482. Willibald also, in his life of Boniface, speaks of the influence of such ecclesiastics in Thuringia: *qui sub nomine religionis maximam hæreticæ prætatis introduxerunt sectam*, s. 23. Pertz, monumenta II. f. 344. Compare also the admonition of pope Gregory III. in the epistola ad episcopos Bavariae et Alemanniæ, that they should receive Boniface with all due respect as the pope's legate, adopt the liturgy and creed according to the model of the Roman apostolic church, and beware of the doctrina venientium Brittonum vel falsorum sacerdotum et hæreticorum, ep. 45. In his letter to the German bishops and dukes (ep. 6) the pope states it as being the object of Boniface's mission, partly to convert the heathen, partly *et si quos forte vel ubique a rectæ trinitati fidei deviassæ cognoverit aut astutia diabolica suasos erroneos repererit, corrigat.* It must be owned, that even in the official letters, the customary forms of the chancery style from the liber diuturnus seem sometimes to have been preserved unaltered, though they may have been scarcely suited to these new relations. Thus, in the letter to the Germans (ep. 10), in reference to the obstacles to ordination: "non audeat promovere Afros passim ad ecclesiasticos ordines prætendentes, quia aliqui eorum Manichæi, aliqui rebaptizati sepius sunt probati." Which warning might have some force in the time of Gregory the Great; but could hardly be in place, as applied to the churches in Germany.

nations among whom the Christian church was to be planted, and whether they were qualified to labour for this object to so good a purpose—whether they could have laid the foundation of an ecclesiastical structure which might promise to endure and bid defiance to destruction; but certainly Boniface, who had been educated in the faith of the Roman theocratic church system, and inured to the punctilious obedience of the monks, could not, from his own point of view, and according to his own religious convictions, act otherwise than he did; and he verily believed that, by so acting, he was taking the best course to promote the prosperity of the new church. Indeed, the course of development pursued by the church under the guiding hand of a higher Spirit, had long since been settled after such an order as that the nations should first be trained and nurtured to the full age of gospel freedom by means of a legal Christianity, or a gospel in the form of Judaism.

Supported by letters of recommendation from the pope, Boniface directed his steps, in the first place, to the mayor of the palace; and, after having made sure of his co-operation, proceeded to Hessia, and then to Thuringia. It might be expected, from what has already been said, that Boniface would find a foundation of Christianity already laid for him in Thuringia. This, too, is presupposed by the pope in the letters which Boniface carried with him.\* The pope required the people of Thuringia to erect churches,† and to build a

\* Nor does Willibald, in his life of Boniface, say that he first planted Christianity here, but that he restored it. He says, that the bad administration of the country under the dukes dependent on the Frankish empire, (since the destruction of the Thuringian empire, A. D. 531,) favoured the revival of paganism, and even induced a portion of the people to become subject to the pagan Saxons. He says of Boniface: *seniores plebis populique principes affatus est eosque ad acceptam dudum christianitatis religionem iterando provocavit*, s. 23.

† Willibald mentions first the ecclesiastical institution founded by Boniface at Orthorp (Ohrdruf, in the dukedom of Gotha); a church together with a monastery. But as this was already something considerable, and Boniface had now gained a wide entrance among the people, it certainly could not have been the first church which he founded in this country; but this was perhaps the little church near the neighbouring village of Altenberga, which tradition derived from him, the first which he caused to be erected, when coming from Hessia to Thuringia. See Löffler, *Celebration in remembrance of the first church in Thuringia, Gotha 1812.*

house for Boniface. We see from the letters of the pope to some of the nobles and other believers in Thuringia, that a contest was already going on there between the pagan and the Christian party; for he praises the Christian dukes because they had not suffered themselves to be moved by any threats of the pagans to take part again in idolatry, but had declared that they were ready to die rather than do anything to injure the Christian faith.\* Boniface now brought back to Christianity such of the chief men as had fallen away. Having confirmed the wavering, he proceeded to labour for the suppression of paganism, which still continued to prevail among the mass of the people, and for the further spread of Christianity among them. Up to the year 739, Boniface had baptized towards one hundred thousand of the pagan inhabitants of Germany; and this, as pope Gregory III. remarks, was effected by his exertions and those of Charles Martel.† In the case of these conversions by masses, there may have been a great deal at first which was merely superficial; but the suppression of idolatry, the destruction of every monument that spoke to the senses, the prohibition of all pagan customs, participation in the rites of Christian worship, and the religious instruction given in connection therewith, all this could not but serve to advance the work; while at the same time provision was made for Christian education by schools connected with the monasteries. There is no indication that Boniface ever made use of the power of the mayor of the palace to enforce baptism. For what purpose he required it, we are informed by himself;‡ for he says that, without the protection of the Frankish princes, he would have been able neither to govern the people nor to defend the clergy, monks, and nuns (who superintended the instruction of the youth); nor, without their command and the fear of their displeasure, to forbid idolatry and the pagan custom.§ And how much he

\* Ep. 8. *Quod paganis compellentibus vos ad idola colenda fide plena responderitis, magis velle feliciter mori, quam fidem semel in Christo acceptam aliquatenus violare.*

† Ep. 46. *Tuo nomine et Caroli principis.*

‡ Ep. 12 to Bishop Daniel.

§ *Sine patrocinio principis Francorum nec populum regere nec presbyteros vel diaconos, monachos vel ancillas Dei defendere possum vel ipsos paganorum ritus et sacrilegia idolorum in Germania sine illius mandato et timore prohibere valeo.*

could effect by destroying an object of superstitious veneration among the people, which from one generation to another, and from the childhood of each individual, had enthralled their senses, is shown by the following example. At Geismar which lay at no great distance from Fritzlar, in the department of Gudensberg, in Upper Hesse, stood a gigantic and venerable oak, sacred to Thor, the god of thunder, which was regarded by the people with feelings of the deepest awe, and was a central spot for their popular gatherings.\* In vain had Boniface preached on the vanity of idols. The impression of that ancient object of superstitious veneration even counteracted the effect of his sermons, and the newly-converted were drawn back by it to paganism. Boniface † resolved to destroy one sensuous impression by means of another of the like kind. Accompanied by his associates, he repaired to the spot with a large axe. The pagan people stood around, full of rage against the enemy of the gods, and they expected nothing but that those, who dared attack the sacred monument, would fall as dead men, struck by the avenging deity. But when they beheld the huge tree, cut into four pieces, fall prostrate before their eyes, their faith in the power of the dreaded deity vanished. Boniface took advantage of this impression, and, to make it a lasting one, immediately caused to be constructed out of the timber, a church, which he dedicated to St. Peter the apostle, whose authority and whose church it was his great aim to establish.

But although he endeavoured, after this manner, by outward

\* In the district of the ancient Matium.

† An interesting comparison is furnished by what happened in the province of Madura, in India, in August 1831. There stood in this place a gigantic odda tree, a hundred and twenty years old, which had for several generations been held in great veneration, and was regarded as the seat of the patron god of the province, to whom every year it was customary to present a great offering. At first a number of boughs were chopped off, which were employed in the construction of a school house. But as the converted head of the village, who had done this afterwards, fell sick, the pagan people regarded it as a punishment sent upon him by the idol. To confute their opinion, he now resolved to cut away the entire tree. As it was falling many hundreds collected around it full of amazement, and they still continued visiting it for a whole week, contemplating it as a wonder, and threatening the new convert with the vengeance of their god. See Missionary Register for 1832, p 399.

and sensible impressions, to acquire an influence over the rude people, yet it is evident, from many indications, that he by no means neglected the work of religious instruction, but well understood its high importance. His old friend Daniel, bishop of Winchester, who was now blind, gave him the following advice with regard to religious instruction.\* He was not to begin at once with refuting the idolatrous notions of the pagans, but in the way of interrogation, in which he ought to show his own thorough knowledge of their system, he was to lead them on to discover for themselves the self-contradiction it involved, and the absurd consequences it led to; all without ridiculing or exciting them, but rather with gentleness and moderation.† Then he should occasionally introduce, here and there, scraps of Christian doctrine, comparing it with their superstition, so that they might rather be shamed than excited to anger. That he himself preached, and used the sacred Scriptures in preaching, appears evident from a remarkable commission which he gave to his old friend, the abbess Eadburga, who used to send him clothes and books from England.‡ He requested her to procure for him a copy of the epistles of St. Peter written with gilt letters, which he might use in preaching. By the use of this he hoped to inspire, in sense-bound men, a reverence for the Holy Scriptures, and no doubt, also, for St. Peter, whose missionary he conceived and represented himself to be.§ How diligently he studied the Scriptures may be inferred from the fact, that he often imported from England copies of the same, together with expository works, fairly written, on account of his weak eyes. Thus, for example, he secured a copy of the prophets prepared by his teacher the abbot Wimbert, without abbreviations, and with plain and distinctly separated letters.|| There are still extant a few fragments of discourses preached by Boniface, probably after being translated into the language of the country; one of which is an exhortation to chastity and purity of

\* Ep. 14.

† Non quasi insultando vel irritando eos, sed placide ac magna objicere moderationes debes. • ‡ Ep. 19.

§ Et quia dicta ejus, qui me in hoc iter direxit, maxime semper in praesentia cupiam habere.

|| Quia librum prophetarum talem, qualem desidero, acquirere non possum, et caligantibus oculis minutus ac connexas litteras discere non possum.

morals, as necessary in order to a worthy participation in the sacrament of the supper. "We address you," said he, "not as the messengers of one, from the obligation of obedience to whom you can *purchase exemption with money*," but of one to whom you are bound by the blood he shed for you. My beloved, we are men covered with the defilement of sin, and yet we would not suffer our limbs to be touched by the defiled; and we believe that the only begotten Son of God willingly took upon his own body the defilement of our sins. Behold, brethren, our king, who has condescended to make us his messengers, comes directly after us; let us prepare for him a pure mansion, if we desire him to dwell in our bodies." In the other sermon he replies to the objection, why have the messengers of salvation come so late after so many have already been ruined? in the following language:—"You would have a right to complain of the late coming of the physician, if now, when he is come to attend you, you are eagerly bent on making the right use of the remedies he prescribes." Instead of minutely inquiring why the remedy came so late, they should rather hasten to apply it, now that they had it.

The whole conduct of Boniface in founding the new church shows also how much importance he attached to the spiritual culture of the people by Christianity. The same thing is apparent from his founding monasteries, especially in the central spots of the tribes whence proceeded the culture of the people as well as the reclaiming of the wilderness; and into which he introduced monks † and nuns from England, who brought with them various arts and sciences,‡ and books for the instruction of the youth,§ and who furnished missionaries for the people.|| It is apparent also from his ordinances, which

\* Doubtless an allusion to the *Compositiones* customary among the German tribes. Out of accommodation to this custom, against which Boniface seems here to be guarding himself, grew the indulgences.

† The monks magistri infantum, ep. 79.

‡ Willibald says (s. 23), E Britanniae partibus servorum Dei plurima ad eum tam lectorum quam etiam scriptorum (who busied themselves in the copying of books), *aliorumque artium* eruditorum virorum congregatio-  
nitis convenerat multitudo.

§ He also procured books from Rome. See ep. 69. ep. 54.

|| Boniface went a long distance to meet such new comers. See ep. 80. They wrote to England about their labours among the heathen: "Deus

directed that no man or woman should stand in the relation of godfather or godmother unless he or she knew by heart the creed and the Lord's Prayer; that no person should be appointed priest who could not repeat the form of renunciation at baptism, and the confession of sins in the language of the country.\*

Boniface met with various opponents in his field of labour. Concerning these, it must be confessed, we can get but little certain knowledge from his by no means unprejudiced and impartial reports. Some of them were free-minded British and Irish clergy, particularly such as would not submit to the Roman laws touching the celibacy of priests,† but whose married life appeared to Boniface, looking at the matter from his own point of view, an unlawful connection. Others were rude and ignorant men, whose lives were a disgrace to their profession, who freely took part in the sports of the chase and in warlike expeditions, made traffic of their priestly functions, and spread among the untutored people false notions of Christianity extremely detrimental to the interests of religion and morality.‡ Others again were ecclesiastics or monks, who, for some reasons or other, whether right or wrong, struggled against the authority of Boniface, while the veneration inspired by their lives of rigid austerity had secured for them a strong interest in the affections of the people. Certainly the schisms occasioned by such ecclesiastics, even though they belonged themselves to the better class, could not but hinder the prosperous growth of the church among so rude a people. § These per-

per misericordiam suam sufficientiam operis nostri bonam perficit, licet valde sit periculosum ac laboriosum paene in omni re, in fame et siti, in algore et incursione paganorum inter se degere."

\* See f. 142 in epp. ed. Würdtwein.

† As it is ordered by an Irish synod, A.D. 456, can. 6, that the wives of the ecclesiastics, from the ostarius to the priest, should never go about otherwise than veiled—see Wilkins's Concil. Angl. T. I. p. 2; so it is evident from this, that the marriage of these ecclesiastics was considered regular.

‡ There were those who, in consequence of their scanty knowledge, and to please the rude multitude, mixed up pagan customs with Christian, and even sacrificed to idols. According to Boniface's report to pope Zacharias: "Qui tauros, hircos, diis paganorum immolabant."

§ Boniface says, ep. 12: *Quidam abstinentes a cibis, quos Deus ad percipiendum creavit. Quidam melle et lacte proprie pascentes se, panem et cæteros abjiciunt cibos.* He seems to describe these as false

sons, too, may have had their influence at the court of the warlike Charles Martel, with whose interests and inclinations many things which they aimed at and advocated perhaps more fully coincided than the strict ecclesiastical rules of Boniface. At any rate the latter could not succeed, as long as Charles Martel lived, in making good his authority as papal legate against these antagonists. But as he had sworn to withdraw fellowship from all ecclesiastics who opposed the Roman church-system, he was not a little perplexed, when he visited the court of Charles Martel, to find that he could not avoid having some fellowship with the persons above described, while yet he could not neglect the oath without prejudice to his ecclesiastical institutions. He consoled himself, however, by reflecting that he satisfied his oath if he shunned all voluntary connection and all church-communion with those persons. In this opinion, he was confirmed by his prudent friend, bishop Daniel, to whom he confessed his scruples; for that prelate advised him to pay a due regard to the circumstances of the case, and to accommodate himself to them with a wise dissimulation subservient to higher ends.\* Boniface could not feel perfectly at rest on this subject until he had also made known his scruples to the pope, who placed him under his oath, and had received from him an authentic interpretation of its import. The pope wrote back to him, that the clergy who lowered the dignity of their office by a disreputable life, he should endeavour to set right; but if they would not allow themselves to be corrected, he still ought not to avoid their

teachers; and from this account we might be led to surmise that there was some connection of these mortifications with theoretical errors, and we might be reminded particularly of Gnostic errors. But had Gregory been knowing to anything of this kind, he who was so ready to detect dangerous heresies in the slightest deviations from the prevailing notions, would certainly have stated the matter more distinctly. It is very possible that these people, without following any erroneous tendency in doctrine, simply lived in habits of unusually rigid abstinence. Ascetic severity under other circumstances would perhaps have appeared to Boniface a praiseworthy thing; but he judged otherwise in the case of these people, because they availed themselves of the consequence they thus acquired to render themselves independent of him, and to resist his ordinances.

\* The principle of the officiosum mendacium, quod utilis simulatio assumenda sit in tempore, which he defended, as others had done before him, by the examples of St. Peter and St. Paul, ep. 13.

company, nor to refuse to sit at the same table with them; for it was often the case, that men could be more easily led into the right way by friendly intercourse and the familiar society of the table, than by harsher measures.\*

Having, within the space of fifteen years, founded the Christian church among a hundred thousand Germans, and erected church-edifices and monasteries in the midst of what was before a wilderness, Boniface, in 738, repaired for the third time to Rome, for the purpose of an interview with the new pope Gregory III., and to obtain from him a new commission with ample powers. This pope empowered him also, as his legate, to visit the Bavarian church,† which had not as yet received any permanent organization, and was going to decay, and moreover stood open to the British and Irish missionaries, who were regarded at Rome with jealousy. He was invited there also by the Bavarian duke Odilo. On his return from Rome, therefore, in 739, he paid a visit to Bavaria, where he resided for some time, and founded, under the papal authority, the four bishoprics of Salzburg, Regensburg, Freisingen, and Passau.

Soon after he had resumed his former field of labour, a political change took place, which was favourable to his objects, in the death of Charles Martel, in the year 741. Martel, although he had received Boniface as a papal legate, and on the whole favoured his mission, yet could never be prevailed upon to give him such decided preponderance as would have enabled him to crush all the opponents to his measures, and to the Roman supremacy; and as the rough warrior encouraged the clergy to take a part in his warlike enterprises, and did not hesitate to sequester, at will, the property of churches and convents,‡ he himself often came into conflict with Boniface, and his interests in respect to the new ecclesiastical foundations. Far greater was the influence acquired by Boniface over the sons of Charles Martel, Carloman, and Pipin. In the former of these, the religious bent was so strong, that he once

\* Ep. 24. *Plerumque enim contingit, ut quos correctio disciplinæ tardos facit ad percipiendam veritatem normam, conviviorum sedulitas et admonitio disciplinæ ad viam perducat justitiam.*

† Yet the missionaries in the present case may have shown themselves more inclined to subject themselves to the authority of the Romish church, as we see in the example of Virgilius.

‡ See Mabillon, *Annal. Ord. Benedict.* T. II. f. 114.

thought of relinquishing the sovereign power for the monastic life. The other understood far better than his predecessor how to enter into the plans of Boniface for the Christian culture of the German people. He was also inclined to form a stricter alliance with the papacy, with a view to the promotion of his own political interests. In particular, it was now in the power of Boniface to carry out two important objects calculated to secure the better organization of the new church. One was the *foundation of several bishoprics*, the other the *arrangement of the synodal system*. He founded, in 742, under the papal authority, three bishoprics for the new church, at Würzburg, at Erfurt,\* and at Burburg, not far from Fritzlar. By the introduction of regular provincial synods, the means were to be provided for maintaining an oversight over the entire moral and religious condition of the people, and for a form of legislation suited to the necessities of the church. In the Frankish church itself these regular synods had fallen into utter desuetude. No such meeting had been held for a period of eighty years; and Carloman himself called upon Boniface to appoint one, and to take preventive measures against the lamentable abuses that had crept into the administration of church affairs.† At these synods Boniface, who acted in the name of the pope, enjoyed the first seat; and his influence was thus extended over the whole Frankish church, which stood so much in need of new regulations. At the same time pope Zacharias had expressly clothed him with full powers to introduce into the Frankish church a thorough reform, in his name.‡ He held, in all, five such synods. At these synods he

\* In reference to this, a difficulty arises from the fact, that no later indications are to be found of any such bishopric; whether it was that for special reasons, in the circumstances of the times, this arrangement was soon altered, or whether a false reading has here crept in.

† See ep. 51. *Carolomannus me accersitum ad se rogavit, ut in parte regni Francorum, quæ in sua est potestate, synodum facerem congregari, et promisit, se de ecclesiastica religione, quæ jam longo tempore id est non minus quam per sexaginta vel septuaginta annos calcata et dissipata fuit, aliquid corrigeret et emendaret velle.*

‡ The words of pope Zacharias, ep. 60, are: "Nos omnia, quæ tibi largitus est decessor noster, non minuimus, sed augemus. Nam non solum Bojoariam, sed etiam omnem Galliarum provinciam nostra vice per prædicationem tibi injungimus, ut quæ repereris contra christianam religionem vel canonum instituta ibidem detineri, ad normam rectitudinis studeas reformatum."

caused laws to be passed, whereby the clergy were bound to a mode of life better corresponding to their profession, and forbidden to take any part in war or in the chase on pain of being deposed from office; laws to secure the general diffusion of religious instruction, and to suppress the superstitious customs which had sprung out of paganism, or which at least were grounded in pagan notions transferred to the objects of Christianity,\* such as soothsaying, pretended witchcraft, amulets, even though passages of Scripture were employed for that purpose.† At some of these synods, from the year 744 onward, several persons were tried as teachers of false doctrines, belonging, as it may be conjectured, to the number of those of whom Boniface had already complained, but whom, in the times of Charles Martel, he was not strong enough to put down.

One of these persons, Adelbert, was a Frank of mean descent, probably belonging to that class whom Boniface had some time before described as persons who, by the austerity of their lives, acquired consideration in the eyes of the multitude, and then used their influence against himself. Adelbert was honoured by the people as a saint and a worker of miracles.‡

\* E. g. hostias immolatitias, quas stulti homines juxta ecclesias ritu pagano faciunt, sub nomine sanctorum martyrum vel confessorum. The German synod of the year 742. See p. 233.

† Si quis clericus auguria vel divinationes, aut somnia sive sortes seu phylacteriad est scripturas observaverit, p. 269. Neither was the chrism to be used as a remedy for diseases, p. 267.

‡ The priest of Mayence, whose brief report of the life of Boniface has been published by the Bollandists, at the V. of June, relates, that he hired people with money to assume the appearance of being affected by various bodily ailments, and then to pretend being cured by his prayers. See Pertz, T. II. f. 354. But this, being the testimony of a passionate opponent, is not entitled to credit. When a man came once to be regarded as a false teacher, nothing remained but to declare the miracles supposed to be wrought by him to be either works of sorcery, performed by the aid of an evil spirit, or a deception. For the rest, it was no uncommon thing in the Frankish church, for fanatics or impostors, who contrived to give themselves an air of sanctity, to draw around them, as men who could work miracles, a crowd of followers. Thus Gregory of Tours (l. IX. c. vi.) relates the instance of a certain Desiderius, who went about in a cowl and a shirt of goat's hair, pretending to lead a strictly abstemious life, and to enjoy special interviews with the apostles Peter and Paul; and numerous bodies of the country people allowed themselves to be deceived by him—many sick were brought to him to be healed.

He found ignorant bishops who were willing to give him episcopal ordination.\* It would seem that Adelbert, with many fanatical extravagances, and with many qualities also betokening a purer and freer gospel-spirit, was opposed to the reigning doctrines or to the reigning ritual of the church. Boniface reports of him,† that he carried his pride to such extravagant length, as to put himself on a level with the apostles. Hence, while he thought apostles and martyrs not worthy of the honour of having churches dedicated to them, he yet had the folly to dedicate oratories to his own name. But if his claiming to be of equal dignity with the Apostles was the reason why Adelbert thought churches ought not to be erected in the name of the Apostles, he might then say that churches could as properly be consecrated to his own name as to the names of the Apostles; and in that case there would be no inconsistency in his language, of which Boniface, however, seems desirous to convict him. But from the words of Boniface himself it may, perhaps, be gathered, that he ventured on a false construction of Adelbert's assertions. Adelbert probably said churches ought not to be dedicated to the name of *any man*,‡ therefore not to the name of an apostle; and in

In the case of those who were lame, he caused their limbs to be stretched with great violence—an experiment which turned out sometimes fortunately, sometimes unfortunately. *Ut quo virtutis divina largitatio dirigere (malo their limbs straight again) non potest, quasi per industriam (by the aid of human art) restauraret. Unique apprehendebant pueri ejus manus hominum, alii vero predes, tristesque diversis in partes, ita ut nervi patuerentur abrumpi, et non parentur, dimiscebantur exanimes.* In another place (1. X. c. 25) Gregory relates the instance of a man who, at first doubtless in an attack of insanity, had given himself out as Christ, and a woman whom he carried about with him, as the Virgin Mary. The people flocked to him, and brought their sick, who were to be healed by his touch. At the same time he set himself up as a prophet. More than three hundred suffered themselves to be deceived by him, and among these were some priests. Gregory says, that in France many such had appeared, who, after a few women had joined them, whom they extolled as saints, found believers among the people.

\* Boniface says that, contrary to the church laws, he had received ordination without a specific diocese, an *ordinatio absoluta*. This was undoubtedly contrary to the church laws; but in the case of missionaries it could not be otherwise: and in fact it was the same with Boniface himself. Probably Adelbert wanted to labour as a missionary; like so many even ignorant and fanatical persons, who believed they felt this call.

† *Fp. 62.*

‡ As is intimated by the words “*dignabatur consecrare.*”

this case he might certainly be accused of self-contradiction, if he permitted oratories to be dedicated to his own name. Yet even a fanatic would not be likely to fall into so gross a contradiction as this. Probably the truth was that Boniface represented the conduct of Adelbert in the false light which grew out of his own inferences from his doctrines. And this view of the matter is confirmed when we find that Adelbert was a severe censurer of the zeal, manifested by so many in those times, to visit the "threshold of the Apostles" (the *limina Apostolorum*) instead of seeking help from the omnipresent God, or from Christ alone. The bad effect on the morals of the pilgrims, which, as Boniface himself is compelled to acknowledge, resulted from these visits to Rome, would be an additional reason for the opposition shown to them.\* Adelbert procured crosses to be erected in the fields where the people might assemble. He built small oratories in the same places and near fountains of water. Hence the accusation of Boniface, that he had allowed these oratories to be dedicated to his own name, was probably no more than an inference, founded perhaps upon the fact, that the people were wont to name these oratories after Adelbert. Large numbers of the people might be induced to forsake the public churches and the other bishops and to assemble in these places, saying, we shall be helped by the merits of the holy Adelbert; perhaps Adelbert's followers paid him the excessive veneration usually bestowed on other men who bore the reputation of saints. One mode of expressing this excessive veneration, which in these times was by no means singular, may have been that alleged by Boniface (if his report can be relied on), namely, that Adelbert's followers were in the habit of carrying about as reliques hair and nails taken from his person (from which, however, it would be wrong to infer that he sought any such honour, though it might be true that he took no pains to avoid it), and hence proceeded to form a party. When people came

\* Boniface endeavoured to have a law enacted in England by a synod and by the kings, whereby pilgrimages to Rome, which so frequently led to corruption of morals, should be forbidden to married women and the nuns, *quia magna ex parte pereunt, paucis remanentibus integris. Perpaucae enim sunt civitates in Longobardia vel in Francia aut in Gallia, in qua non sit adultera vel meretrix generis Anglorum*, see ep. 73 to Cuthbert Archbishop of Canterbury, ed. Würdtwein, p. 201.

to him to confess\* their sins, he is said to have told them he knew all their sins, for to him every secret thing was open. They needed not confess to him, but might consider all their sins forgiven, and return in comfort and peace to their homes. Now it is quite possible that Adelbert may have been misled by a fanatical self-exaltation actually to make use of some such language; but the assertions of Boniface, a man so constantly on the watch for heresies, and so inclined to paint every heretic in the blackest colours, may well be regarded with suspicion. Perhaps Adelbert was merely opposed to the church-system of confession and penance; perhaps he told people they needed only confess their sins to God, and, confiding in the forgiveness of sins obtained by the merits of Christ, they might go away comforted. There is still extant the fragment of a prayer by him,\* in which no trace is to be discovered of the fanatical self-exaltation here ascribed to him, but which, on the contrary, breathes the spirit of Christian humility. "Lord, Almighty God, Father of the Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ! thou the Alpha and Omega, thou who sittest above the seventh heaven, above Cherubim and Seraphim, thou supreme Love, thou Fountain of joy, I invoke thee, and invite thee to me the poorest of thy creatures, since thou hast vouchsafed to say, whatever ye ask of my Father in my name, that will I do. I beg of thee, therefore, to bestow upon me thyself."† In another passage, however cited from this prayer, follows something which does not so well accord with the pure Christian spirit expressed in the first words; but which, however, in a dark, fanatical mysticism, might perhaps be reconciled with them, namely, the invocation of angels, many names of whom are cited which do not elsewhere occur.‡ In the acts of the Roman council mention is made of a pretended letter of Christ, § which in Jerusalem has fallen from

\* In the transactions of the Roman council, which was held in consequence of the report drawn up by Boniface. Bonifac. ep. 174.

† According to another reading "To thee I direct my prayer."

‡ At the council these unknown names of angels were declared to be the names of evil spirits, which Adelbert invoked to his assistance, and this was brought against him as a specific charge.

§ There were at the present time many pieces of forgery of this character in circulation. In a capitulary of the emperor Charles, A.D. 789, it is said: *Pseudographie et dubiae narrationes vel quae omnino contra fidem catholicam sunt, ut epistola pessima et falsissima, quam transacto*

heaven, and which Adelbert took pains to circulate. The superscription of this letter was couched in a singular style, and the Roman church was recognized in it as the one in which were deposited the keys of the kingdom of heaven. From this it would seem evident that the mysticism of Adelbert could not be considered as opposed, at least in a consistent manner, to the hierarchical system, as we might be led to suppose it would be, on various grounds of evidence. According to the statements of Boniface, he drew notice also by exhibiting certain relics, to which he ascribed great miraculous power, and which, as he pretended, had been brought to him from the farthest boundaries of the world by an angel in human form.\* Yet it deserves to be mentioned, that Boniface says it was *in his younger days* † he came forward with such pretensions. From this we might infer that he had not always maintained the same opinions and professions; and if such were the case, the contradictions so apparent in the tenets ascribed to him are to be explained, perhaps, not so much from the mingling together of opposite elements in his mode of thinking, as from confounding together the reports of two different periods in the history of his religious development, the earlier and the later. We might suppose that the element of mysticism in him had, at the outset, been covered up under a religious tendency bordering on sensuous fanaticism, and more closely attaching itself to the forms of the church, and that gradually he stripped away these sensuous forms one after the other. Yet owing to the vague and untrustworthy character of all our present sources of information, nothing certain can be said on the subject. On the whole, it is evident that Adelbert must have found no inconsiderable support even from those who could not be classed with the ignorant multitude; for, while living, he experienced an honour which the most attached disciples are wont to bestow on a venerated master only after his death. His life was written before its close, and in this document he is styled the holy and blessed servant of God.

anno dicebant aliqui egrantes et in errorem alios mittentes, quod de cœlo cecidisset, nec credant nec legantur; sed comburantur. Mansi. Concil. T. XIII. p. 174, appendix.

\* By such pretences, the people were often deceived in these times, see Gregor. Turon. l. IX. c. VI.

† In primæva ætate.

VOL. V.

G

(sanctus et beatus Dei famulus).\* But then, if he had many disciples, a great deal which ought to be attributed to the mistakes or to the exaggeration of his followers, may have been incorrectly charged to his own account.

When Boniface had compelled Adelbert to cease from preaching,—perhaps before his report to the pope,—and when, by the authority of the mayor of the palace, he had effected his arrest, Adelbert's numerous followers complained that they had been deprived of their holy apostle, their intercessor and miracle-worker. The reputed worker of miracles stood higher in the estimation of the multitude than Boniface, whose zeal was tempered with Christian prudence, whose religion was marked by coolness of understanding rather than by the impulses of enthusiasm, and who had no ambition to be considered a worker of miracles. This was one peculiarity which distinguished him from other laborious and successful missionaries of the same age. Not even his own disciples have been able to record a single miracle wrought by him.†

\* The introduction only of this biography is known to us through the citations in the acts of the Roman council. It is here said that from his birth he was filled with the grace of God, in imitation of the account of John the baptist's nativity. True, this expression was declared at the Roman council blasphemous; but many similar ones may be pointed out in the *Actis sanctorum*, belonging to this age.

† The priest of St. Martin's church in Utrecht, who in the ninth century drew up a short biographical sketch of Boniface (published by the Bollandists, at the fifth of June), was obliged to vindicate himself from the reproach of not having cited any miracles wrought by him. What he says on this point is worthy of notice, as an expression of the Christian sense of truth which is to be found extending through all the centuries. Everything, says he, depends on the agency of God, which operates on man's inmost being, produces miracles from within outwards, and by means of miracles quickens the inward susceptibility to truth, *intus, qui moderabatur quinque idololatras et incredulos trahebat ad fidem.* The same Spirit distributed his gifts in manifold ways. *Uni dabat fidem ut Petro, alteri facundiam prædicationis ut Paulo, and as an instrument of the same Spirit, Boniface had shown himself.* *Faciebat autem signa et prodigia magna in populo, utpote qui ab *ayrotis mentibus* *morbos invisibilis* propellebat.* After having prosecuted this thought still further, he adds, *Quod si ad solam corporum salutem attenditis et eos angelis sequi paratis, qui membrorum debilitates jejunii et orationibus integratii restituunt, magnum quidem est quod dicitis, sed hoc sanctis quodammodo et medicis commune esse crebris remedium manifestatur eventibus.* *Sed et quemlibet in his talibus miraculis sublimem oportet magna seipsum circumspectione munire, ut nec jactantia emergat nec appetitus laudis*

The second of these antagonists of Boniface, Clement, an Irishman, was a person of an entirely different bent of mind. The theological training which he received in Ireland rendered him, no doubt, Boniface's superior in largeness of understanding and in Christian knowledge, while it raised him above all the fanatical extravagances which we observed in Adelbert. We recognize in him an instance of one of the earliest reactions of the Christian consciousness, still holding fast to the primitive truth, against the *hierarchical* spirit, or the principle of the Old-Testament theocracy, which characterized the middle ages. He would allow to the writings of the older fathers,\* and to the canons of councils, no authority binding on faith; and from this it may with probability be inferred, that he conceded such authority to the holy Scriptures alone, acknowledging them as the only fountain and directory of Christian faith. The application of this principle would lead him, of course, to many important deviations from the reigning doctrines of the church; though we have no exact information as to what these deviations were. Boniface charges him with maintaining, that he could continue to be a Christian bishop though the father of two sons by adultery. It is probable that Boniface in this case allowed himself a little prevarication; and because the marriage of a bishop, considered from his own point of view, was an irregularity, chose to disparage it under the name of an unlawful connection. But there can be no question that Clement defended the legality of marriage in a bishop, on such grounds as he found stated in the sacred Scriptures. Boniface, again, accused him of bringing back Judaism, because he declared it lawful to marry the widow of a deceased brother. But the point charged, that he considered the Mosaic law still obligatory on Christians, would lie against him only in case he declared a Christian *bound*, according to Deut. xxv., to marry the widow of a deceased brother when the latter left no posterity; and in that case, he must have declared all other marriage with the widow of a deceased brother forbidden,

surripiat, ne forte quum alios coöperante sibi virtute sanaverit, ipse suo vitio vulneratus intereat.

\* Boniface names particularly Jerome, Augustin, and Gregory the Great, because it was customary to appeal especially to their authority in the Western Church.

because all other marriage of a brother's wife, this only excepted, is forbidden in the Mosaic law. Perhaps, therefore, he only pronounced the ecclesiastical ordinance, whereby this was placed among the prohibited degrees of relationship, an arbitrary one; and adduced the above mentioned Mosaic statute in evidence that such an ordinance had no foundation whatever in the divine law, since otherwise Moses would not have allowed of any exception. The example of Cilian shows how important such disputed points, on questions of ecclesiastical law, might become to the missionaries ; and it is worthy of remark, that on another kindred point, the Christian feelings of Boniface himself brought him into collision with the statutes of the ecclesiastical law. Although he found the principle to prevail both in the Roman and in the Frankish church, that the so-called spiritual kinship of godfather or godmother should prevent a marriage contract between the parties, yet he could not feel the propriety of it, nor did it seem to him to have any foundation either in Scripture or in the essence of Christianity ; since baptism establishes a spiritual relationship among all Christians.\* Finally, this Clement taught, as Boniface reports, that Christ, in descending to Hades, delivered the souls not only of believers, but also of unbelievers and idolaters. This we must understand as follows : He declared himself opposed to the common doctrine of the *descensus Christi ad inferos*, according to which Christ is supposed to have delivered only the pious dead of the Jewish nation. That is, he found in this doctrine, because he held only to the Scriptures, an intimation, that all those, who, during their life on earth, had no opportunity of hearing the message of the gospel, were after their death taught by Christ himself to know him as the Saviour, and brought into fellowship with him. A reflecting missionary among the heathen, might easily be led to entertain doubts of the doctrine, which taught that all pagans were unconditionally lost ;†

\* *Quia nullatenus intelligere possum, quare in uno loco spiritualis propinquitas in conjunctione carnalis copule tam grande peccatum sit, quando omnes in sacro baptismate Christi et ecclesiæ filii et filiæ, fratres et sorores esse comprobemus.* See ep. 39, 40 and 41, f. 88. etc.

† From l. VII. ep. 15 of Gregory the Great, we see that two ecclesiastics at Constantinople had also come to the conclusion, *Christum ad inferos descendenter omnes qui illic confiterentur eum salvasse atque a poenis*

while to the purely human feelings of those to whom the Christian doctrine was thus presented, much offence might be given, many doubts awakened in their minds. But whoever was led, by his own careful examination of the divine word, to reject that doctrine, would easily be tempted to go further, and to cast himself loose from the views hitherto held concerning the doctrine of predestination ; and accordingly we find that Boniface actually accuses Clement of teaching other things, contrary to the Catholic faith, relative to the divine predestination.\* Whether Clement, however, went so far as to maintain the doctrine of universal restoration,† is a point which cannot be certainly determined. Of course, neither the peculiar spiritual bent nor the doctrines of Clement, were suited to procure for him, in this rude age, so large a number of followers as flocked after the fanatical Adelbert.‡

Boniface, in bringing his complaint against these two persons before pope Zacharias, proposed that, in order to render them harmless, they should be confined for life. The pope, in his reply to Boniface's report, A.D. 745, confirmed the sentence by which they were condemned, but without determining anything with regard to their persons, except that they should be removed from their spiritual charges. But it is worthy of remark, that perhaps the just and humane Zacharias was led, by another report from Germany, to doubt the justice of the proceedings instituted against these two men ; for about two years later, in 747,§ he ordered a new investigation into the cases of the two deposed bishops.|| *And should they be convicted of having in any respect departed from the right way, then if they showed an inclination to be*

*debitis liberasse. Which to Gregory, judging from his point of view, the companion doctrine of the church, appeared extremely erroneous.*

\* *Multa alia horribilia de predestinatione Dei.*

† It may be remarked, that Scotus Erigena, in whom we find similar doctrines, came from Ireland.

‡ The presents which Boniface sent to the deacon Gemmulus, to whom he entrusted the management of his cause with the pope (a silver ewer and a napkin), might throw a suspicion upon him, were it not the custom of those times, as is evident from Boniface's letters, to accompany letters sent from a distance with presents. To a pope, Boniface sent as a present a napkin, to wipe the hands or feet (*villosa*), and a small sum of gold or silver.

§ See ep. 74.

|| Together with Adelbert is here mentioned a certain Godalscius, who perhaps was associated with him.

set right, measures were to be taken for proceeding with them according to the ecclesiastical laws; but should they obstinately persevere in insisting upon their innocence, they were to be sent, in company with two or three of the most approved ecclesiastics, to Rome, in order that their case might be carefully investigated by the apostolical see, and that they might then be treated according to their deserts. So important was it considered by the pope, to take care that his agents should not proceed with injustice or harshness against two men, in whom he could not possibly have any personal interest; and so far was he from being willing to sacrifice them, by giving the sanction of his own supreme judicial authority, to a man who had done so much for the interests of the papacy, and who ever remained so faithful an instrument in promoting them. Had the interests of the papacy been the chief thing aimed at by the pope, he would not have hesitated to follow at once the report of Boniface; but as it was, the powerful Boniface seems still to have found means to delay the execution of the pope's intentions.

Respecting the fate of Clement, we have no exact information; though it is certain, from the character of his doctrines, that he could not expect any more favourable issue of his case to result from the examination at Rome; but with regard to Adelbert, we know that by the sentence of Boniface he was subjected to imprisonment for life, and that after having effected his escape from his cell, he came to a miserable end.\*

This was not the only case in which pope Zacharias showed that he was not to be governed at once in his decisions by the reports of the credulous Boniface a man so ready, on some misunderstanding of his own, to set down his opponents as heretics—but that he was inclined to hear these opponents speak for themselves. Virgilius, another Irish priest in Bavaria, got into his first difficulty with Boniface by occasion of a baptism informally administered. Because the ignorant priest had been guilty of an error in repeating some of the

\* The presbyter of Mayence relates (see Monumenta, ed. Pertz, II. 355), that he was confined in the convent of Fulda, but that he succeeded in effecting his escape with a boot full of nuts, by which he meant to sustain himself on the way. But he was fallen upon, robbed, and murdered by shepherds.

words of the Latin formula,\* Boniface declared that the baptism was invalid, and must be repeated. Virgilius protested against this; he ventured with Sidonius, another priest, to appeal to the pope, and the latter decided against Boniface.† The same Virgilius, who seems to have stood in some estimation with the duke Odilo, afterwards presented himself as a candidate for one of the bishoprics founded by Boniface. The latter, however, endeavoured to exclude him. He accused Virgil of maintaining the heretical opinion, that under the earth existed another world and other men--perhaps a misapprehension; perhaps the opinion that there were antipodes. Now the pope himself, it is true, found this opinion objectionable; perhaps on account of the inference, which might be supposed to follow, that the whole human race did not spring from Adam, that all men were not involved in the original sin, that all did not need a Redeemer. And on the presumption that Boniface's report agreed with the truth, he decided that Virgil should be deposed from the priestly dignity. He addressed a threatening letter to Virgil and Sidonius, and assured Boniface that he believed him rather than the two former; but still he summoned them both to Rome, where their case might be more accurately investigated, and a definitive sentence passed accordingly. And the result teaches that Virgil must have succeeded in justifying himself before the pope, for he became bishop of Salzburg, and attained afterwards to the honours of a saint.‡

Though, for the rest, Boniface constantly acted in subservience to the popes, and paid them the utmost deference, yet at the same time he never hesitated to speak out what a pope might not like to hear, when the duty of his calling required that he should do so. He fearlessly censured pope Zacharius for permitting the Roman church to incur the

\* *In nomine patriæ et filia.*

† See ep. 62.

‡ See the epigram of Alcuin upon him. As Boniface fell into collision for the most part with educated Irishmen who were striving to be independent of him, so we find among them a certain Samson, a priest, who according to Boniface's report (ep. 82), had asserted, that one might become a Christian by the imposition of the hand of a bishop, without baptism. That he should have asserted this in such a way that a priest should have so over-estimated the importance of the episcopal laying on of hands, can hardly be supposed, and we are here forced to the conjecture that Boniface had not rightly apprehended his opponent's meaning.

charge of simony, by demanding money for the bestowment of the pall.\* He complains, in a letter to this pope, of the bad example set at Rome to the ignorant and rude people from Germany; of the various superstitious practices allowed there on the first of January; of the custom among the women to hang amulets around their arms and limbs, which amulets were publicly exposed for sale. Now the vulgar had it to say, that such things were done at Rome under the eyes of the pope; and so his instructions, he said, were not a little hindered of their effect.† He cites the authority of St. Paul and of Augustin against such practices,—and urgently demands of the pope a suppression of these abuses.‡

The reformation of the church, according to the plan of Boniface, required especially the re-establishment of a well-devised church organization, at the head of which should stand the pope as the director of the whole. All the bishops should hold the same relation to the metropolitans as these held to the pope himself. As the bishops, when they found it impossible themselves to do away abuses in their dioceses, should discharge their consciences by bringing the matter before their proper superiors, the metropolitans, thus throwing the responsibility on the latter; so the metropolitans, or archbishops, should proceed in the same way towards the pope.§ And an oversight, administered on this organisational plan, over the whole church, might undoubtedly, in these times of rudeness, where so many things were contrary to ecclesiastical order, have served a very salutary purpose; but the metropolitan constitution was not so well adapted to the relations of the

\* Zacharias himself says (ep. 60, f. 148) of the letter, in which Boniface complains of this, *litterae tue nimis animos nostros conturbaverunt*. He denies the whole thing. Perhaps the officials of the papal chancery had acted without the pope's knowledge or will.

† Ep. 51. *Quae omnia eo, quod ibi a carnalibus et insipientibus videntur, nobis hic et impropterum et impedimentum prædicationis et doctrinæ perficiunt.*

‡ The pope did not deny that such abuses had once more crept in at Rome; but affirmed, that since he had attained to the papal dignity they had been wholly suppressed.

§ See ep. 73 to the English Metropolitan Cuthbert, to whom he sent a report of the administration of his office thus far. *Sic omnes episcopi debent metropolitano et ipse Romano pontifici, si quid de corrigendis populis apud eos impossibile est, notum facere et sic alieni fient a sanguine animarum perditarum.*

French empire, as it had been to the old Roman empire, and the spirit of the Frankish bishops, so inclined to independence, was not ready to accommodate itself to any such form. Hence Boniface had on this point many obstacles to encounter. True, when pope Zacharias committed to him the business of arranging the order of the Frankish church, Boniface ordained three metropolitans for this church, and the pope sent him the palls for the same;\* but he found himself unable to carry this arrangement immediately into effect.† The new German church also continued to subsist for a longer time without metropolitans. It is true, in the year 732, pope Gregory III. appointed Boniface archbishop, and sent him the pall,‡ but without a determinate metropolis. On the death of Raginfred, bishop of Cologne, in 744, Boniface proposed that the bishopric of Cologne should be converted into a metropolis, and conferred on himself.§ This was connected with his favourite plan, to resume once more the personal superintendence of the mission among the Frieslanders, which, since the death of Willibrord in 739, had not been so rigorously conducted as before; for after the death of Willibrord, he reckoned the mission among the Frieslanders as belonging to the sphere of labour assigned him as papal legate among these tribes: and in accordance with the full powers conferred on him for that purpose by the mayor of the palace, Car-

\* See ep. 59 of pope Zacharias.

† The pope was much surprised to learn that Boniface afterwards demanded nothing but the *pallium*, and asked him, *cur tantæ rei facta sit permutatio?* ep. 60. At the council of Soissons, in the year 744, he succeeded, however, in securing the appointment of two metropolitans. He wrote, at some later time, to the pope, exculpating himself (ep. 86) *de eo autem, quod jam praterito tempore de archiepiscopis et de palliis a Romana ecclesia pretendis juxta promissa Francorum sanctitati vestrae notum feci, indulgentiam apostolicæ sedis flagito, quia, quod promiserunt, tardantes non impleverunt et adhuc differtur et ventilatur, quid inde perficere voluerint, ignoratur, sed mea voluntate impleta esset promissio.*

‡ See ep. 25.

§ With the bishop of Cologne Boniface early fell out. The former wanted to extend his diocese over a part of the field of labour assigned to Boniface, though he had taken no pains whatever to diffuse Christianity among the pagan tribes bordering on his diocese. Gregory II., who decided against the bishop of Cologne, describes him as the *episcopum, qui nunc usque desidia quadam in eadem gente prædicationis verbum disseminare neglexerat, et nunc sibi partem quasi in parochiam defendit.*

loman,\* he had ordained his countryman and disciple, the priest Eoban, bishop of Utrecht. But from Cologne, as a centre, it would be easy for him to extend his watch and care also over Friesland.† The Frankish nobles were generally satisfied with this arrangement, and the pope confirmed it; but a portion of the clergy, as we may infer from the intimations of Boniface, in his letter to the pope, were opposed to it.‡ These, as it seems, were composed of such as had all along formed a party against Boniface. The pope believed that this opposition might be despised; but subsequent events showed that it was of moment. In addition to this, another event happened, which gave a different turn to the choice of a German metropolis.

In the army, which in 744 marched to the assistance of the Thuringians against the Saxons, was Gerold, bishop of Mentz.§ He was slain by a Saxon; and Charlemagne appointed his son, by name Gewillieb, to succeed him in the office. This son, though in other respects a person of blameless manners, yet wanted both the disposition and the education requisite for a spiritual office;|| being passionately devoted, as probably

\* See ep. 105.

† Boniface had himself, on proposing the establishment of a metropolitan see at Cologne, mentioned the circumstances which to him seemed to recommend that city as a proper place for the purpose, as the pope says (ep. 70): *Civitatem pertinetem usque ad paganorum fines et in partes Germanicarum gentium, ubi antea prædicasti.* That not Mentz, as it reads in the superscription of the letter, ed. Würdtwein, but Cologne is to be understood which—Pagi also remarks—may be gathered not only from the circumstances stated, but also from what the pope expressly says in the same letter: *De civitate, quæ nuper Agrippina vocabatur; nunc vero Colonia juxta petitionem Franeorum per nostræ auctoritatis præceptum noniuni tuo Metropolin confirmavimus.*

‡ Quidam falsi sacerdotes et schismatiæ hoc impeditæ conati sunt.

§ We are indebted for a circumstantial account of this event to that presbyter of Mentz to whose report we have already referred on a former page. True, his statements cannot be relied on, and are in this case full of anachronismus; but in Mentz, where he wrote, he might easily obtain better information on this particular subject, and his account wears altogether the impress of truth.

|| The presbyter of Mentz says of him: *Hic autem honestis moribus, ut ferunt, nisi tantum quod cum herodiis et canibus per semetipsum jocabatur.* If he is the individual whom Boniface describes in his letter to the pope (see ep. 70) “adultati clericu et homicidæ filius, in adulterio natus et absque disciplina nutritus;” we must remember, that from his

his father also had been, to the sports of the forest. When the two armies again met in the field, Gewillieb challenged the slayer of his father out of the ranks of the Saxons, and killed him on the spot, to revenge his father's death. In pursuance of the ecclesiastical laws, passed at his own suggestion, Boniface was obliged to demand that Gewillieb, who, though a bishop, still bore the sword, should be deposed from his office. This was done at a synod in the year 745, over which Boniface himself presided. In this case, it was the less possible to accuse him of interested motives, because the transfer of the metropolitan see to Mentz, would, according to what we have already remarked, be directly opposed to his own wishes and cherished plans. Besides, he could not, at the beginning, have possibly conjectured, that the deposition of Gewillieb would be followed by this result; since he was still negotiating with the pope, for the establishment of the metropolitan see at Cologne. Gewillieb, it is true, repaired to Rome, for the purpose of laying his appeal before the pope, and the latter kept the investigation of the affair in his own hands;\* but the issue of it must doubtless have led to the confirmation of the sentence passed by the German synod. The removal of Gewillieb, and the vacancy left in the bishopric of Mentz, now enabled the party who strove to hinder the establishment of a metropolitan see at Cologne, to carry their point; and it was thought advisable to make the city of Mentz, which had already enjoyed that honour, once more the seat of an archbishopric. Boniface, in communicating this decision of the Frankish princes and nobles to the pope, besought the latter, at the same time that he might be allowed, on account of his great age and bodily infirmities, to consecrate some other person than himself to the office of archbishop. This petition of Boniface was certainly not an act of dissimulation or hypocritical humility, traits of which not the least vestige can be detected in his general character; nor is it by any means necessary so to understand it, as if he wished to devote his already far advanced, but still energetic old age to an inactive repose. Perhaps his simple own point of view he might thus describe a bishop living in wedlock, and taking an active part in war.

\* He says, in his letter to Boniface, *Dum advenerit, ut Domino placuerit, fiet.*

motive was to avoid the great burden of outward business which must be connected with the administration of the German archbishopric, and not to suffer his labours as papal legate, from whose duties he by no means wished to be released, to be circumscribed by being obliged to confine himself to a distinct archiepiscopal see, and one of such a character as seemed to promise him but little freedom for missionary journeys. He wished to consecrate his last energies, freely and exclusively, to the instruction of the pagan and newly converted populations belonging to his field of labour, to which he also reckoned Friesland.

He had already, some years earlier,\* requested of Pope Zacharias, that he might be allowed to select, and ordain a presbyter to succeed him in his office; some such person as, after common deliberation, should appear to him, under the existing circumstances, the most suitable for the place; and he referred to the fact, that Gregory III. had, in the presence of Zacharias at Rome, already invited him to select for himself and consecrate a successor;—whether it was, that Boniface even now entertained the purpose just mentioned of committing to or sharing with another the administration of the external affairs of the church, so as to leave himself more freedom for the work of religious instruction; or whether, remembering the uncertainty of life, and the dangers to which he was constantly exposed among the pagans, he wished, with a prudent regard to the future, to have everything so arranged that after his death the young church should not go to destruction. But the old ecclesiastical laws did not permit that a bishop should nominate and ordain his successor during his own life-time, a fact of which Boniface perhaps was not aware; and the question now came up, on the presentation of the petition of Boniface to the pope, whether, considering the extraordinary circumstances of the case, the pope ought to depart from the accustomed form, as indeed it should seem that the altogether new and difficult relations of things must often call for deviations of this sort. But so thought not the pope, at that time. He replied to him† that his request, being incompatible with the laws of the church, could in nowise be granted. Even were the pope desirous of it, still it was not in his power to

\* See ep. 51.

† See ed. Würdtwein, p. 113.

confer on him this favour ; for as no man knew whether he or his fellow stood nearest the grave, so it might easily happen that his destined successor might be outlived by himself. He could, however, select some priest as his special assistant in discharging the duties of his office, who, after having proved himself in the work, might be found worthy of a more exalted station. Let it only be your constant prayer, said the pope, that a successor well-pleasing to God may be provided for you ; and if the priest whom you may select should live, and at the close of your own life be found still fitted for the office, you may then publicly designate this person as your successor, and he may come to Rome and receive his ordination. Even this, he said, had never before been granted to any one.

When Boniface next presented his proposal to resign the archiepiscopal office, the pope, with a view to encourage him in his old age to perseverance in his multiplied and manifold labours, conceded still more. He wrote him\* that he ought by no means to leave the episcopal see at Mentz, but should let the word of our Lord be fulfilled in his case, Matth. xxiv. 13: He that persevereth unto the end shall be saved. But if the Lord gave him an altogether suitable person, qualified to watch over the welfare of souls, he might consecrate him a bishop as his own representative ; and such a person might everywhere act as his colleague in the service of the church. Having obtained this privilege of the pope, he now determined† to prepare a retreat for his last days, at his favourite foundation, the monastery of Fulda ; there to refresh, in some measure, his enfeebled body, now suffering under the effects of his long labours and advanced age. In advising the pope of this step, he gave him to understand, that it was by no means his intention to abandon the duties of his calling, but that he meant, as Zacharias had exhorted him, to persevere in it to the end ; that the monastery of Fulda was the most convenient of all places for devoting his last energies to the good of the people, to whom he had preached the gospel, " for the four nations to whom, by the grace of God, we have preached the word of Christ, dwell in a circle around this spot. To these I would

\* Ep. 82.

† He proposed this to the pope some years later, in the letter in which he requested him to confirm what he had done in founding the monastery of Fulda, ep. 86.

be useful so long as I live or have my senses ; for I wish to persevere in the service of the Roman church, among the German people to whom I was sent, and to obey your commands.”

Among the last public acts of Boniface in Germany, belongs the part he took in a political revolution, which was not without its importance as contributing to the firm establishment of the new ecclesiastical foundations. The mayor of the palace, Pipin, after having for a long time exercised the royal *authority*, determined to assume the royal *name*, and to deprive the last branch of the old legitimate, ruling family, Chiladeric III., who was, in fact, a king only in name, also of this name. That he could believe it possible to justify, by the authority of the pope this illegal act to his own conscience and in the eyes of the people, this without doubt was already one result of the influence exercised by Boniface in changing the religious mode of thinking,—a result of the new point of view in which the church was presented, as a theocratical institution, and the pope, as theocratical head over the nations. To Boniface himself it must have appeared of the utmost advantage to his field of labour, that Pipin, by assuming the royal name, should obtain still greater authority, so as to be able to place a stronger check on the individual Dukes, whose arbitrary will threatened to become destructive to all civil and ecclesiastical order ; and with the views he entertained respecting the relation of the church to civil society, and of the pope to the church, such an act, promising to be so advantageous both to church and state, could easily be rendered legal by the decision of the pope, as the supreme organ of Christ in the government of the household of faith.† From the close alliance between Boniface and the pope, from his position as

\* *In quo loco proposui aliquantulum vel paucis diebus fessum senectute corpus requiescendo recuperare, et post mortem jacere. Quatuor enim populi, quibus verbum Christi per gratiam Dei diximus, in circuitu loci hujus habitare dinoscuntur. Quibuscum vestra intercessione, quamdiu vivo vel sapio, utilis esse possum. Cupio enim vestris orationibus, comitate gratia Dei in familiaritate Romanae ecclesiae et vestro seruitio, inter Germanicas gentes, ad quas missus fui, perseverare et pracepto vestro obedire.*

† Thus Willibald, in the life of Boniface, s. 23, shows that this insurrection of paganism in Thuringia had been in great measure provoked by the tyrannical Dukes.

mediator between the latter and the Frankish church, it may be inferred, that the negotiations concerning this important matter were not managed without his intervention; though it remains uncertain whether anything in the oral communications which Boniface's delegate, the presbyter Lull, is said to have made about this period to the pope, had reference to this business.\* Certain it is, that it was Boniface, who in the year 752, at Soissons, by the pope's commission, administered to Pipin the royal unction.

His vast field of labour among foreign nations did not, however, render Boniface forgetful of his native land. Though his duties compelled him to forego his cherished wish of returning there once more, yet he ever took a special interest in its affairs.† He maintained a constant correspondence with bishops, monks, nuns, and princes of his country, and as it gave him peculiar pleasure—to use his own words‡—to hear his countrymen praised, so he was grieved at being told of their faults. He was much pained on learning that one of the princes of his native land, Ethelbald king of Mercia, led an immoral life, and thereby encouraged immorality among his people; and that he was guilty of arbitrarily appropriating the property of the church. Conceiving himself both bound and fully authorized, by the pope's commission, to exert his influence against any unchristian conduct which came to his knowledge among the nations, even beyond the more narrow circle under his immediate superintendence,§ he felt himself constrained to transmit, in the name of a small synod, a very decided letter of remonstrance to this petty sovereign. In this letter he described to him, how severely, to the shame of the

\* See ep. 26, concerning Lull, *habet secreta quædam mea, quæ soli pietati vestrae profiteri debet.*

† In writing to a priest of his native land, to whom he sent the letter of recommendation, presently to be mentioned, for the purpose of being transmitted to the king of the Mercians, he says: *Hæc verba admonitionis nostræ ad illum regem propter nihil aliud direximus, nisi propter puram caritatis amicitiam et quod de eadem gente Anglorum nati et enutriti hic peregrinanur*, ep. 71.

‡ In the letter referred to: *Bonis et laudibus gentis nostræ lætamur, peccatis et vituperationibus contristamur.*

§ See ep. 54, as the preceptum Romani pontificis, *si alicubi viderem inter Christianos pergens populos erroneous vel ecclesiasticas regulas depravatas vel homines a catholica fide abductos, ad viam salutis invitare et revocare totis viribus niteret.*

English people,\* the violation of chastity was punished in the mother country, among the pagan Anglo-Saxons, who followed the laws of God written on the heart; and held up for his warning the divine judgments on immoral nations. But to conciliate the good-will of the prince, and secure a favourable reception of this admonitory epistle, Boniface wrote him also another shorter letter, which he accompanied with presents, namely, a hawk, two falcons, two shields, and two lances.† He exhorted the primate of the English church, archbishop Cuthbert of Canterbury,‡ informing him of the regulations adopted by himself in the Frankish and German churches, to take measures for improving the condition of the church in England; and it was probably owing to his influence, which extended even to this distant region, that in the year 747, a synod for the reformation of abuses was convened at Cloveshove (Cliff), under the presidency of this archbishop.

Boniface, acting on the permission he had received from the pope, appointed his countryman Lull, who had been for twenty years trained under his eye, and had served as his colleague, to succeed him in office, and ordained him a bishop. Nothing was wanting, except that he should be recognized as his successor by royal authority, and thus secured in the exercise of all the rights pertaining to such a relation. Impressed with a feeling that the infirmities of age announced for him a speedy death,§ his mind was occupied with the care of providing for his ecclesiastical foundations, the destruction or dismemberment of which he had reason to fear, unless they were placed under the direction of a firm and able head, such as he wished to give them in the person of Lull. The letter in which he solicited Fulrad, the Frankish lord chamberlain, to bring this matter before king Pipin, touchingly expresses the paternal anxiety of Boniface for those who had been committed by God to his pastoral care: "Nearly all my disciples," he writes, "are foreigners—a few priests, established at various points for the service of the church and of the people; monks, distributed among the monasteries, for the purpose of teaching the children to read; and many aged persons, who have long lived

\* Ep. 72.

† Ep. 55.

‡ Ep. 73.

§ Ep. 90, to the Frankish lord chamberlain Fulrad, quod mihi et amicis meis similiter videtur, ut vitam istam temporalem et cursum dierum meorum per istas infirmitates cito debeam finire.

and laboured with me and sustained me. For all these I am anxious, lest after my death they become scattered. I beg, therefore, that they may enjoy a share of your protection, so that they may not be scattered like sheep without a shepherd, and that the people living on the borders of the pagans may not lose the law of Christ. I beg earnestly, in the name of God, that you would cause my son and fellow-bishop, Lull, to be appointed for this service of the people and the churches, as a preacher and guide of the priests and the people. And I hope, if God so will, that in him the priests will find a guide, the monks a teacher of their rule, and the Christian people a faithful preacher and shepherd. I beg such a favour especially for this reason, because my priests sustain a miserable life on the borders of the heathen. Bread to eat they can obtain by their own exertions; but clothing they cannot find there, unless they receive help and counsel from other quarters; for so have I sustained them, that they might be enabled to persevere in their labours for the people in those places."

Having obtained what he wished, and thus made the preservation of the German church independent of his own existence, Boniface concluded not to follow out his earlier intention of passing the remnant of his days in the monastery of Fulda, but to consecrate them to the work with which his missionary activity had first commenced. Probably it was with a special view of having it in his power to enter again, in a more direct and personal manner, upon this mission in Friesland, that it had been his wish to make the city of Cologne the seat of his archbishopric. But now he was brought into collision with the newly appointed bishop, Hildegar of Cologne; for the latter availed himself of certain claims, founded on ancient tradition, to make the church of Utrecht dependent on himself, though he took no active part in preaching the gospel in those regions. Boniface maintained, on the other hand, that the bishops of Cologne, who gave themselves no concern about the mission among the Frieslanders, had no claims to make upon this province of the church, but that the church of Utrecht had been founded by pope Sergius, as a metropolis for the conversion of the Frieslanders, and subject only to the pope;\* whence also it followed, that this church ought, for the present, to stand

\* See ep. 105, to pope Stephen II.

under no oversight but his own, inasmuch as the pope had committed to him, as his legate, the oversight over all these churches, planted among pagan nations. It is so much more reasonable to trace this controversy of Boniface with the bishop of Cologne to his desire of once more taking upon himself, as papal legate, the direction of the mission in Friesland, that we should hardly be justified in adopting the contrary supposition, and in ascribing the plan of his journey to Friesland to an ambition which incited him to make good his power of legate in that country against the bishop of Cologne. Why should he have sought, through so many dangers and difficulties, at such an advanced period of life, to acquire for his few remaining days an honour, which in a much more convenient and less hazardous way he could have procured for himself by negotiation with the pope,\* and with the king of the Franks?

Boniface set out on his journey to Friesland in the beginning of the year 755, under the firm persuasion that he should never return. With this conviction, he took leave of his disciple Lull, and commended to him the preservation and prosecution of the work begun by himself, and in particular the completion of the church, now erecting at Fulda, in which his body was to be deposited. In the book-chest, which he was in the habit of taking with him wherever he went,† that he might have a supply of spiritual books at hand, from which he could read or sing by the way - he gave his disciple charge to place a shroud, in which his body was to be enveloped and conveyed to the monastery of Fulda. With a small retinue, composed partly of clergy and monks, and partly of servants, he embarked on a boat by the river Rhine, and landed at the Zuyder sea. His disciple, bishop Eodan, joined him in Friesland. They traversed the country; many received them gladly; they baptized thousands and founded new churches. Boniface

\* It is singular that the bishop of Cologne provoked this controversy, in opposition to the papal charter founding the metropolitan see at Utrecht (see Würdtwein, ep. 83), by virtue of which Utrecht and Cologne were subordinated to it; and that Boniface did not appeal before pope Stephen II. to the authority of this arrangement by his predecessor. We might infer from this that if the text of this charter is correct, yet it could not in this form obtain, from the first, the power of law.

† The priest from Utrecht says of him, s. 18, *Quocunque ibat, semper libros secum gestabat. Iter agendo vero vel scripturas lectitabat, vel psalmos hymnosve canebat.*

had sent numbers home, after having instructed and baptized them, with the direction to return to him on an appointed day, for the purpose of receiving from him the rite of confirmation. Meanwhile, he had established himself with his associates in tents, on the river Burda, not far from Deckingen,\* and it was the fifth of June, 755, when he expected the return of his spiritual children. Early in the morning, he heard at a distance the noise of an approaching multitude, and full of joy came forth from his tent; but he soon found himself painfully mistaken. The clash of weapons announced anything but a friendly disposition and purpose in the approaching bands. The truth was, that numbers of the pagans, maddened to find that Boniface drew away so many from idolatry, had conspired to devote this day, when so many were to be received into the bosom of the Christian church, to vengeance for their gods. The lay servants would have defended Boniface with their weapons; but he forbade them. With the reliques in his hand, he calmly awaited the issue; he exhorted his attendants not to fear those who could only kill the body, not harm the soul; but rather to be mindful of the infallible promises of their Lord, and to confide in him, who would soon bestow on their souls the reward of everlasting glory. Thus, in his seventy-fifth year, he died a martyr;† and with him, many of his companions, as well as the bishop Eodan, died the same death.‡

Boniface left behind him a series of disciples, who laboured on in his spirit, zealously devoting themselves to the education of the youth, to the business of clearing up and cultivating the soil, partly as bishops and priests, partly as abbots. Among these, the abbot Gregory takes an important place, who prosecuted the work in Friesland. The singular manner in which this person, while a young man, was led to attach himself to Boniface, furnishes a remarkable example of the power which the latter exerted over the minds of youth. When Boniface, on his second journey from Friesland to Thuringia and Hessa,

\* Dockum, between Franeker and Gröningen.

† The presbyter of Utrecht informs us that in the district where this occurred an old woman was still living who related that Boniface, when he saw the fatal blow about to be struck, made a pillow for his head of a volume of the gospels.

‡ According to the story of the ecclesiastic of Munster, there were fifty-two of them.

came into the territory of Triers, he met, in a monastery near this town, with a hospitable reception from a certain abbess **Addula**, who, sprung from a noble family, had retired from the society of the great world to this spot. During meal-time, the duty was assigned to her nephew Gregory (a boy fourteen years old, who had just returned from school), to read some passages from the holy Scriptures. Boniface praised him for reading so well, and asked him to translate what he had read into the German language. As he was compelled to confess his inability, Boniface himself translated and explained the passages read, and made the whole the subject of a discourse, which left a deep impression on the mind of the youth. The latter felt himself so drawn towards him, that he declared himself resolved to go with him, and never to leave him, that he might learn from him how to understand the holy Scriptures. The grandmother, to whom Boniface was at that time wholly unknown, did all in her power to dissuade the boy from executing his resolution; but in vain. He told her, if she would not give him a horse he would follow Boniface on foot wherever he went. Finally she yielded to his wishes, and gave him a horse and servants, that he might be able to follow the missionary in his journeys.\* From this time forward he was the companion of Boniface amidst every difficulty, and went with him also on his last journey to Friesland.† And now, since bishop **Erdan** had suffered martyrdom with his teacher, and the bishopric of Utrecht was for the present unoccupied, Gregory took upon himself the whole care of the mission in Friesland, which charge was also conferred on him by pope Stephen II. and by king Pipin. He did not assume, it is true, the episcopal dignity, but remained a priest; whether he was deterred by his modesty from aspiring after a higher rank,

\* Liudger, the disciple and biographer of Gregory, who had, without doubt, received this story from his own mouth, says respecting it: *Idem spiritus videtur mihi in hoc tunc operari puer, qui apostolos Christi et dispeusatores mysteriorum Dei ad illud inflammavit, ut ad unam vocem Domini relictis retibus et patre sequentur redemptorem. Hoc fecit artifex summus, unus atque idem spiritus Dei, qui omnia operatur in omnibus dividens singulis prout vult.*

† If he had not before, as having himself come from the neighbouring district, pointed out to Gregory this field of labour among the Frieslanders, for whose welfare he ever continued to manifest a special solicitude.

or whether the business connected with the episcopal office did not agree with what he felt to be his peculiar calling, or whether it was that special reasons, in the circumstances of the times, prevented the re-occupancy of the bishopric. But as abbot of a monastery at Utrecht, to which boys of English, French, Bavarian, Suevian, Frieslandish, and Saxon extraction were sent to be educated, he had an ample field of activity. He himself laboured in instructing the Christian and pagan population; and he founded a missionary school, from which missionaries went forth into various fields. To supply the want of a bishop, he got episcopal ordination conferred in his native land on Alubert, an English clergyman, who had joined him in his work. He lived to the age of more than seventy years; and laboured as a faithful teacher, to the end. Three years before his death, in the year 781, he was attacked on his left side by a stroke of palsy; yet he did not cease labouring for the instruction and spiritual culture of his people, until his disease became so severe, that he had to be borne on the arms of his scholars wherever his presence was needed. In his last hours, his disciples gathered round his bed, to hear from his lips the word of exhortation, and to be edified by the example of his faith. "He will not die to-day," said they to each other;—but, summoning his last powers, he turned to them and said: "To-day I shall have my release." He died, after having prayed and received the holy supper, with his eyes fixed on the altar.

A second among the disciples of Boniface, to whom the German church, and the early culture of the nation were greatly indebted, was the abbot *Sturm*.\* He descended from a noble and devotedly Christian family in Bavaria. While Boniface was engaged in organizing the Bavarian Church, Sturm, yet a boy, was committed to him by his parents, to be regularly trained for the spiritual office. The former placed him in the monastery of Fritzlar, one of his earliest foundations, over which presided the abbot Wigbert, a companion in missionary labours. To the direction of this person he entrusted the boy's education. This being completed, he was consecrated as priest, and assisted Boniface as a fellow-labourer in the missionary work. After having laboured three years under Boniface's directions he was seized with a desire of

\* *Sturmi*, or *Stirme*.

following the example of others, who had retired into the wilderness, and trained themselves, by every sort of self-denial, in the contest with savage nature, to the austere life of the monk. Boniface yielded to the wishes of his disciple. He hoped to make use of him as an instrument for converting the vast wilderness, which then, under the name of Buchwald (Buchonia), covered a large part of Hessa, into a cultivated country. He gave to Sturm two companions, to go with him on his journey, and dismissed them with his blessing to find a dwelling-place in the wilderness. After having, for three days, traversed the forest, riding on asses, they finally came to a spot which seemed to them susceptible of cultivation, Herold's field (Hersfeld). Here they built huts, which they covered with bark ; and here they spent some time in devotional exercises. Thus, in the year 736, was laid the foundation of the monastery of Hersfeld. After this Sturm returned again to his beloved master, for the purpose of making report to one so exact and prudent in the examination and calculation of the minutest details, concerning the situation of the place, the quality of the soil, and the springs of water. He was satisfied with all but one thing ; the place seemed to him too much exposed to the ravages of the Saxons. Long and vainly did they seek, wandering up and down on the Fulda, for a place of settlement such as Bonifacee would approve ; but the latter stimulated his disciple to new activity, exhorting him to patience, and confidently assuring him that God would not fail to show him the place prepared for his servant in the wilderness. For many days he roamed the forest, in all directions, entirely alone, singing psalms as he went, to strengthen his faith, and cheer his heart, fearless of the numerous wild beasts prowling in the wilderness. He took repose only at night, constructing a rude hedge of hewn branches around his ass, to protect him from beasts of prey ; and then, after calling upon the Lord, and signing the cross on his forehead, laying himself down composedly to sleep.

Thus he discovered at last a spot for a settlement, against which Boniface had nothing to object ; and here, in 744, was founded the monastery of Fulda. This was Boniface's favourite foundation. Through his influence the monastery obtained great privileges from the pope. It was to be independent of all spiritual jurisdiction of the bishop, and subject

to no one but the pope.\* He directed that his body should be deposited there, which contributed in no small degree to give consideration to the monastery. He sent the abbot Sturm to Italy for the purpose of studying there the patterns of the old conventional institutions, particularly of the original convent of the Benedictines at Monte Cassino, bidding him to avail himself of all the information he could gather for the benefit of his monastery. After his return Sturm directed, through a long series of years, the energies of four thousand monks, by whose unsparing labours the wilderness was gradually reclaimed, and brought into a state of cultivation. His activity at a later period was interrupted by the devastating inroads of the Saxons. By their threats he was often compelled, when a very old man, to seek safety in flight. After a flight of this sort, to which he had been forced when sick, having returned back to his convent,† when security was restored, he felt the approach of death. He now caused all the bells to be rung, so as to bring together the monks, that his near death might be announced to them, and they might be invited to pray for him. A portion of the monks having assembled around his bed, he begged them to forgive him if, through the sinfulness cleaving to all alike, he had wronged any one of their number, adding that, from his whole heart he forgave all men all the injuries he had received, and pardoned even his constant enemy, the archbishop Lull. On the day of his death, the 17th of December 779, one of his monks told him he was now certainly going to the Lord, and expressed the hope that when he was with the Lord he would remember his disciples, and pray for them. He looked upon them and said, "So order your conduct that I may have courage to pray for you, and I will do what you require." ‡ Thus was laid here the foundation of a seminary of Christian education, which, in the following centuries, proved eminently serviceable to the German church.

The longest continued and the most violent opposition to

\* But this exemption contributed, also, to keep alive the embittered feelings between archbishop Lull, Boniface's successor, and the abbot Sturm: and the influence of the former, as well as many other things, occasioned his temporary disgrace at the court of Pipin, and his banishment.

† The emperor had sent him his own physician, Wintar, but the medicine prescribed by the latter made his disease worse.

‡ See the account of his life by his scholar and successor, abbot Eigil, recently published in Pertz's *Monumentis*, T. II.

the establishment of the Christian church was made by the powerful race of the Saxons in Northern Germany. The blame is to be imputed, in part, to the means employed to effect this object. It required peculiar wisdom to find a way of introducing Christianity among a people of so warlike a character, whose ancient objects of veneration were so intimately connected with their whole character and constitution. But instead of this everything, on the contrary, was done to prejudice the minds of the people against the new religion. Along with Christianity the whole structure of the hierarchy, against which in particular the free spirit of the Saxons revolted, was at once to be introduced. The payment of church tithes, which was to be everywhere enforced, was regarded by them as a sign of disgraceful bondage, and served to render still more odious the religion which carried with it such a regulation. In addition to this, the Christian church and the dominion of the Franks were continually presented to them as closely connected; and hence the attachment which bound them to their old freedom and independence led them to repel both together—Christianity being regarded as a means for subjecting them to the Frankish yoke. The army of the emperor Charles was followed by priests and monks, prepared to baptize the conquered, or those who yielded to force, or who were inclined to purchase peace for the moment by obedience to the church; and to found among them churches and monasteries.\* The doctrines of Christianity, which came to them thus accompanied, would naturally be slow to gain their confidence. Large bodies of them often allowed themselves to be baptized in mere pretence, and submitted to the dominion of the church, resolved already to cast off, at the first favourable opportunity, all that had been imposed on them. This they did, when they revolted again from the Frankish empire. The monastery of Fulda, whose abbot Sturm had laboured most zealously to plant the Christian

\* See the Life of abbot Sturm, l. c. c. 22, where it is said respecting the effects of the campaigns of the emperor in the years 772 and 776, *Partim bellis, partim suasionibus, partim etiam muneribus maxima ex parte gentem illam ad fidem Christi convertit*; and the abbot Alcuin writes, in the year 790, to a Scottish abbot, ep. 3: *Antiqui Saxones et omnes Frisonum populi instante Rege Carolo alias præmis et alias minis sollicitante ad fidem Christi conversi sunt.*

church among the conquered Saxons, then became a signal mark for their vengeance.\* The pious and far-sighted abbot Alcuin best understood what had prevented the establishment of the Christian church among the Saxons; and he gave the emperor, his bishops, and high officers the wisest counsels with regard to the missionary-work; of which, however, they made but little use. Thus to the imperial chamberlain and lord of the treasury, Magenfrid,† he wrote—appealing to the words of our Lord, himself, Matt. xxviii. 19—three things should go together, the preaching of the faith, the bestowment of baptism, and the exhibition of our Lord's commandments. Without the concurrence of these three parts the hearer could not be led to salvation. But faith was a voluntary thing, and not to be forced. To baptism, indeed, one might be forced; but that was of no avail to faith.‡ The grown-up man must say for himself what he believed and desired; and if he professed the faith in a hypocritical manner, he could not truly attain to salvation. Therefore preachers to the heathen are bound to instruct the people in the faith in a friendly and prudent way.§ The Lord knew them that were his, and opened the hearts of such as he pleased, so that they might be able to recognize the truth preached to them.|| But after they have received the faith and baptism, in proceeding to set before them the precepts of religion, some regard should be paid to the needs of the weaker minds; great demands ought not to be made upon

\* When the Saxons had, in 778, begun a new war, Sturm, together with his monks, was obliged to flee, having heard that the approaching Saxons intended, in their rage, to burn down the convent, with the monks and all that was in it. See the Life of Sturm, s. 23. † Ep. 37.

‡ Attrahi poterit homo ad fidem, non cogi. Cogi poteris ad baptismum. sed non proficit fidei.

§ Unde et predicatores paganorum populum pacificis verbis et prudentibus fidem docere debent.

|| The Augustinian doctrine of predestination had, however, this injurious effect, that whenever such a work turned out a failure, men, instead of seeking for the cause in the want of correct teaching, and in the use of wrong means, sought rather to trace it to the want of all-efficient grace, and to non-predestination. Thus even Alcuin, in the 28th letter to the emperor—though with the intention, no doubt, of showing that the *whole* blame could not be cast on the emperor, says: Ecce quanta devotione et benignitate pro dilatatione nominis Christi duritiam infelicitis populi Saxonum per veræ salutis consilium emollire laborasti. Sed quia electio needum in illis divina fuisse videtur, remanent hucusque multi ex illis cum diabolo dannandi in sordibus consuetudinis pessimæ.

them at once, but, in accordance with St. Paul's direction, they should be fed at first with milk, and not with strong meat.\* Thus the Apostles, Acts xv., laid none of the burthens of the law upon the converted gentiles. Paul gloried in supporting himself by the labour of his own hands, Acts xx. 34; 2 Thess. iii. 8; 1 Cor. ix. 15, 18. Thus the great apostle, who was specially chosen by God to preach the gospel to the heathen, had acted, in order effectually to remove every pretext or occasion for accusing the preacher of covetousness; so that none should preach God's word out of the love of gain, but each should do so sustained by the love of Christ, as our Lord himself commanded his disciples: Freely ye have received, freely give. "Let but the same pains be taken," he then went on to say, "to preach the easy yoke and the light burthen of Christ to the obstinate people of the Saxons, as are taken to collect the tithes from them, or to punish the least transgression of the laws imposed on them, and perhaps they would no longer be found to repel baptism with abhorrence. Let the teachers of the faith but train themselves after the example of the Apostles,† let them but rely on the gracious providence of Him who says, Carry neither purse nor scrip, &c.; and of whom the prophet declares, He saveth them that trust in him.‡ This I have written to you—says he after these directions—that thy admonitions may be of service to those who apply to thee for advice."§ With peculiar freedom and sharpness does Alcuin express his views of the measures adopted by the emperor, in a letter addressed to that monarch himself.|| He calls upon him to conclude, if possible, a truce with the abominable people (the Saxons). All threats ought for a time to be suspended, that they might not become inveterate in their hostile feelings.

\* Alcuin by no means intends to say here that a loose morality should be first preached, so as not to repel the weak; but he has in his thoughts the positive laws of the church, the claims on the people in reference to the bearing of the public burthens, the payment of tithes.

† Sint prædicatores, non prædatores.

‡ History of Susannah, v. 60, as reckoned to Daniel.

§ In his letter to Arno, archbishop of Salzburg, Let. 72, Alcuin says, *Decimæ, ut dicitur, Saxonum subverterunt fidem. Quid injungendum est jugum cervicibus idiotarum, quod neque nos neque fratres nostri ferre potuerunt? Igitur in fide Christi salvari animas credentium confidimus.*

|| Ep. 80, in the explanation of which I agree more fully with Frobein than with Pagi, though I cannot agree entirely with the former.

to the Frankish empire, and afraid to enter into any compromise whatsoever,\* but be encouraged with hope till by salutary counsel they could be brought back to the ways of peace. The revolts of the exasperated Saxons led to other consequences. They fell upon the provinces already belonging to the empire of the Franks, and here paganism once more revived. He, therefore, cautioned the emperor against allowing himself, by his zeal to win one small state more for the Christian church, to fall into the mistake of exposing to hazard a larger portion of the church in countries where it had already been established.† He disapproved also of the plan of transporting many of the Saxons into the Frankish kingdom, since these very emigrants were the better class of Christians, and might have proved, among their own people, an important element towards the conversion of their countrymen, now wholly abandoned to paganism.‡

It was not till after a series of wars lasting for thirty years, that the emperor Charles succeeded in reducing the Saxons, ever revolting anew against the Christian church as well as the Frankish dominion, to entire subjection ; and by the treaty of peace concluded at Selz, in 804, the authority of both these powers was acknowledged by the Saxons, and in consideration of their binding themselves to the payment of the church tithes, they were for the present released from all other burdens. The Christian church having been thus established among the Saxons by force, it followed as a natural consequence that individuals also would in many cases be constrained to unite with it by force. The punishment of death was threatened against such as refused to receive baptism, or endeavoured to propagate their ancient idolatry by stealth. But it was natural also that many who consented to be baptized, did so only in pretence, and, so far as they could without danger, treated the laws of the church with contempt, and continued secretly to observe the rites of idolatry. To put a

\* Ne obdurati fugiant.

† Tenendum est, quod habetur, ne propter acquisitionem minoris, quod majus est, amittatur. Servetur ovile proprium, ne lupus rapax (the Saxons) devastet illud. Ita in alienis (among the pagan Saxons) sudetur, ut in propriis (the races already incorporated with the empire of the Franks and the Christian church) damnum non patiatur.

‡ Qui foras recesserunt, optimi fuerunt Christiani, sicut in plurimis notum est, et qui remanserunt in patria in fœcibus malitiae permanserunt.

stop to this, the severest laws were enacted. Death was the penalty for setting fire to churches, for neglecting to observe the seasons of fast, for eating flesh during those seasons, if done through contempt of Christianity ; death was the penalty decreed against burning a dead body, according to the pagan mode,—against *human sacrifices*,—pecuniary mulcts, against the practice of other pagan rites.\* In this way the transfer of many pagan customs to Christianity was encouraged ; and thus arose various superstitions, growing out of the mingling together of Christian and pagan elements. More than could possibly be effected by these forcible measures in the present generation, was done for the Christian culture of the rising generation by the establishment of churches and schools. Besides, several individuals now appeared, who did not confine their efforts barely to the suppression of idolatry and of pagan customs, and to providing for the erection of churches, and the establishment of an external form of worship, but also distinguished themselves by their zeal as teachers of the faith. These were partly such as came from the school of the abbot Gregory in Utrecht, and in part such as had been led by the report of the great field of labour and the want of labourers among the Saxons to come over from England. To all these the emperor Charles assigned their several spheres of labour.

One of the most distinguished among these was *Liudger*, a descendant of Wursing, that pious man among the Frieslanders who had actively assisted the archbishop Willibrord. Sprung from a devotedly Christian family, he had early received into his heart the seeds of piety, and these were nourished and still further developed by the influence of the abbot Gregory at Utrecht, into whose school he entered. To indulge the eager thirst for knowledge, which discovered itself in him from childhood, the abbot, in process of time, sent him to England, that he might gather up the knowledge to be obtained in the school of the great Alcuin in York. Well instructed, and provided with a store of books, he returned back to his country. After Gregory's death, he assisted as a presbyter Gregory's successor Albrich, who had been ordained a bishop in Cologne ; labouring with him, spe-

\* See the capitulary for the Saxons, A.D. 789. Mansi Concil. T. XIII. appendix, fol. 181.

cially to accomplish what still remained to be done for the conversion of the Frieslanders. The district in which Boniface had been martyred was the principal theatre of his activity as a teacher of Christianity. His seven years' labour in these parts was, however, interrupted by the revolt of the Saxon leader Wittekind against the Frankish dominion, in the year 782; when the arms of the pagan Saxons penetrated to this spot, and the pagan party in this place once more gained the ascendancy, the churches were burnt, the clergy driven away, and the idol-temples restored. Upon this, he made a journey to Rome and to the abbey of Monte Cassino, for the purpose of studying the great model of ancient monasticism, in this latter place. On his return, after an absence of three years, he found peace restored in his country, Wittekind having finally submitted, and in the year 785 received baptism at Attigny. The emperor Charles assigned him his sphere of labour among the Frieslanders in nearly the same circuit which now includes the towns of Gröningen and Norden. It was he, too, who first succeeded in destroying paganism and establishing the Christian church on the island of Heligoland (Fositesland), where Willibrord had made the attempt in vain. He baptized the prince's son, Landrich; gave him a clerical education, and consecrated him to the office of presbyter. This person laboured for many years as a teacher of the Frieslanders. Liudger founded a monastery at Werden, then on the boundary between Friesland and Saxony, on a piece of land belonging to his family. After the Saxons were completely subjugated, the emperor sent him into the district of Münster, and a place called Minnigerneford was the principal seat of his labours; where afterwards a bishopric was founded, which from the canonical establishment (monasterium) founded by him, received the name of Münster. With untiring zeal he went from place to place, instructing the rude Saxons, and everywhere founding churches, over which he placed, as pastors, priests who had been trained under his own direction. After having for a long time administered the episcopal functions, without the name of bishop, he was finally compelled to assume the episcopal dignity by Hildebold, archbishop of Cologne. His zeal for the spread of Christianity led him to visit the wild Normans, who were then a terror to the Christian nations; and became still more so in

the following times, where he could reckon upon no human assistance. But the emperor Charles absolutely refused to permit it. From such a man, nothing else could be expected, than that he would seek chiefly to work on the *hearts* of men by the power of *divine truth*, as indeed he had been trained to do by the example and the instructions of men who looked upon teaching as their proper calling—Gregory and Alcuin. Even in the sickness which befel him shortly before his death, in 809, he did not allow himself to be prevented by bodily weakness from discharging the spiritual duties of his office. On Sunday preceding the night of his death,\* he preached twice before two different congregations of his diocese, in the morning in the church at Cosfeld, in the afternoon at the third hour, in the church at Billerbeck, where he expended his last energies in performing mass.†

Another of these individuals was *Willehad*, who came from Northumberland. He also laboured at first, and with happy results, in the district of Docum, where Boniface had poured out his blood as a martyr. Many were baptized by him; many of the first men of the nation entrusted to him their children for education. But having come into the territory of the present Gröningen, where idolatry was at that time still predominant, his preaching so excited the rage of the pagan populace, that they would have killed him, when it was proposed by some of the more moderate class, that they should first determine, by lot, the judgment of the gods concerning him; and it was so ordered in the providence of God, that the lot having fallen for the preservation of his life, he was permitted to go away unharmed. He now betook himself to the district of Drenthe. His preaching had already met with great acceptance, when some of his disciples, urged on by an inconsiderate zeal, proceeded to destroy the idol temples before the minds of the multitude were sufficiently prepared for such a step. The pagans, excited to fury, threw themselves upon the missionaries. Willehad was loaded with stripes. One of the pagans dealt him a cut with his sword, intending to kill him, but the blow struck a thong by which the capsule containing the relics he carried about with him according to the

\* He died on the 26th of March, 809.

† The history of his life, by his second successor Alfrid, and published in the second volume of Pertz's *Monumenta*.

customs of those times, was suspended from his neck, and so he escaped. This, according to the prevailing mode of thinking, was regarded as a proof of the protecting power of relics ; and even the pagans were led thereby to desist from their attack on Willehad, who, as they believed, was protected by a higher power. The emperor Charles, who possessed the faculty of drawing around him the able men from all quarters, having by this time heard of Willehad's undaunted zeal as a preacher, and being just at that moment, after the conquest of the Saxons in 779, in want of men like him to establish the Christian church among that people, sent for him ; and having made him acquainted with his views, assigned him his post in the province of Wigmodia, where afterwards arose the diocese of Bremen. He was for the present to preside as priest over this diocese, which included within it a part of Saxony and of Friesland, and to perform every duty of the pastoral office in it, until the Saxons were brought into a condition to be satisfied with the organization of bishoprics. He accomplished more by his zeal in preaching the gospel, than could be effected by the forcible measures of the emperor, and by his labours during two years, he succeeded in bringing over many of the Frieslanders and Saxons to the faith. He founded communities and churches, and placed other priests over them for their guidance. Yet *his* circle of labours also, promising so many happy results, was broken in upon by the revolt of Wittekind in 782, the effects of which extended to this spot. As he felt no fanatical longing after the death of a martyr, and wished not to expose himself to the fury of the pagan army, which threatened death to all Christian clergymen, but in accordance with our Saviour's direction, Matth. x. 23, considered it his duty to flee from persecution, and to preserve his life in order to preach the gospel, he availed himself of the opportunity he had to effect his escape by flight. Many of the clergy, however, appointed by him died as martyrs. Finding no opportunity, during these times of war, of preaching the gospel, he availed himself of this interval of leisure to make a journey to Rome, at the same time that Liudger also visited Italy. Returning from thence, he found a quiet retreat in the convent founded by Willibrord at Afternach (Epternach), and this became the rallying place of his scattered disciples. There he spent two years, partly in exercises of devotion, partly occu-

pied in reading the holy scriptures, and partly with writing.\* But as he ever felt a longing to be actively engaged in promoting the salvation of others, it was with great delight, that after the conquest of Wittekind in 785, he found himself enabled to resume the former field of labour assigned him by the emperor Charles, to whom he had devoted his services in building up the church among the Saxons. Circumstances now for the first time made it possible to carry out the design of here founding an episcopal diocese. In 787, the emperor Charles drew up the records defining the limits of the diocese of Bremen, and Willehad was ordained bishop of Bremen.† On Sunday the first of November, in 789, he consecrated the episcopal head-church in Bremen, St. Peter's, which he caused to be built in a magnificent style. But it was only for two years he was permitted to administer the episcopal office. On one of his tours of visitation, which the wants of his large diocese, consisting of new converts, or those who had received baptism only in pretence, caused him frequently to make, he arrived in 789, at Blexem ‡ on the Weser, not far from Wege-sack, where he was attacked with a violent fever. One of the young men, his disciples, who were assembled round his bed, anxiously solicitous for his life, said to him, "What are the new communities, and the young clergy whose head you are, to do without you? They cannot spare you—they would be like sheep without a shepherd, in the midst of wolves." Said Willehad to this: "O let me no longer be kept away from the presence of my Lord! I desire to live no longer; I fear not to die. I would only pray my Lord, whom I have ever loved with my whole heart, that he would, according to his grace, give me such a reward of my labour as he may please. But the sheep, whom he has committed to me, I commend to his own protection, for even I myself, if I have been able to do

\* In this place he wrote out a copy of the epistles of St. Paul, which was preserved as a precious memorial by his successors, the bishops of Bremen.

† Anschar says, in his account of his life, c. 9: "Quod tamen ob id tamdiu prolongatum fuerat, quia gens, credulitatem divinæ resistens, quum presbyteros aliquoties secum manere vix compulsa sineret, episcopali auctoritate minime regi patiebatur. Hac itaque de causa, septem annis prius in eadem presbyter est demoratus parochia, vocatur tamen episcopus, et secundum quod poterat cuncta potestate præsidentis ordinans.

‡ At that time Pleccatesham.

anything good, have done it in his strength. So neither to you will his grace be wanting, of whose mercy the whole earth is full." Thus he died on the eighth of November, 789.\*

The victory of the emperor, Charles over the Avares (also called the Huns), then dwelling in Hungary, led to attempts to found the Christian church among them. Tudun, one of their princes, came in the year 796,† with a numerous suite, on a visit to the emperor; and, with his companions, received Baptism. The emperor resolved to establish among them a mission, and entrusted the direction of it to Arno archbishop of Salzburg. When the subject of planting the Christian church among the Avares was agitated, the abbot Alcuin gave the emperor excellent advice as to the way in which he might prosecute this work with happier results than had been experienced among the Saxons.‡ He should seek out for the people to whom the Christian faith was as yet altogether new, pious preachers, of exemplary lives; such as were well instructed in the Christian system of doctrines and morals. He then subjoined exhortations similar to those which we have already quoted on a former page.§ The emperor should himself consider, whether the apostles, instructed and sent forth to preach by Christ had anywhere demanded tithes, or given directions for any such thing. Next, he exhorted him to see to it, that everything was done in the right order, and that conviction of the truths of faith went before baptism; since the washing of the body without any knowledge of the faith, in a soul gifted with reason, could be of no use.|| No one, said he, should receive baptism, till he has become firmly grounded in his persuasion of the principal doctrines of Christianity.¶

\* His life by Anschar, archbishop of Hamburg and Bremen, lately published in Pertz's *Monumenta*, T. II.

† See Einhardi *Annales*, at this year.

‡ Ep. 28.

§ He fitly applies here the example of Christ, Matth. ix. 17: *Unde et ipse Dominus Christus in evangelio respondet interrogantibus se, quare discipuli ejus non jejunarent: nemo mittit vinum novum in utres veteres.*

|| *Ne nihil pro sit sacri ablutio baptismi in corpore, si in anima ratione utenti catholica agnitus fidei non praecesserit.*

¶ He mentions the several parts of religious instruction in the following order:—*Prius instruendus est homo de anima immortalitate et de vita futura et de retributione bonorum malorumque et de eternitate utriusque sortis. Postea pro quibus peccatis et sceleribus poenas cum*

And then by a faithful performance of the duty of preaching, the precepts of the gospel should at the proper time be often inculcated on each, until he attained to the ripeness of manhood, and became a worthy dwelling for the Holy Spirit. His friend, archbishop Arno, having requested Alcuin to give him some directions as to the right mode of dispensing religious instruction among the pagans, he at first sent him this letter intended for the emperor.\* Then he wrote him another special letter on the subject,† in which he again strongly insisted on the point, that everything depended on the preaching of the faith and the conviction of the hearers: without this, baptism could be of no avail.‡ For how could a man be forced to believe what he did not believe? Man, gifted with reason, must be instructed, must be drawn onward by word upon word, that he may come to the knowledge of the truths of faith. And especially was it necessary to implore for him the grace of the Almighty; since the tongue of the teacher taught in vain, unless divine grace penetrated the heart of the hearer.§ And here, he insisted with great earnestness upon the necessity of proceeding gradually, and by successive steps, in pressing the requisitions of the gospel on such as had attained to the faith, and of not attempting to extort everything at once.|| A person long established in the faith was

diabolo patiatur aeternas et pro quibus bonis vel bene factis gloria cum Christo fructu sempiterna. Deinde fides sancte trinitatis diligentissime docenda est, et adventus pro salute humani generis filii Dei Domini nostri Iesu Christi in hunc mundum exponendus. Et de mysterio passionis illius et veritate resurrectionis et gloria ascensionis in caelos, et futuro eius adventu ad iudicandas omnes gentes et de resurrectione corporum et de aeternitate paenarum et praemiorum.

\* Ep. 30; and probably he was thinking of the guilty failure of the missionary efforts among the Saxons, when he complained, *Væ mundo a scandalis!* Quid enim auri insana cupidio non subvertit boni! Tamen potens est Deus recuperare quod cœptum est et perficere quod factum non est.

† Ep. 31.

‡ Idcirco misera Saxonum gens toties baptismi perdidit sacramentum, quia nunquam fidei fundamentum habuit in corde.

§ Quia otiosa est lingua docentis, si gratia divina cor auditoris non imbuīt. Quod enim visibiliter sacerdos per baptismum operatum in corpore per aquam, hoc spiritus sanctus invisibiliter operatus in anima per fidem.

|| Matth. ix. 17. Qui sunt utres veteres, nisi qui in gentilitatis erroribus obduraverunt? Quibus si in initio fidei novæ prædicationis præcepta tradideris, rumpuntur et ad veteres consuetudines perfidie revolvantur.

more ready and better fitted for every good work than the mere novice. Peter, when full of the Holy Ghost, bore testimony to the faith, before the emperor Nero in one way ; he answered the maid in the house of Caiaphas in quite another. And the example of gentleness exhibited by our Saviour, when he afterwards reminded him of his fall, should teach the good shepherd how he, too, ought to conduct himself towards the fallen.\* In another letter he says, to the same prelate, " be a preacher of the faith not a tithe-gatherer." †—It is true, this work among the Avaræs seems to have been interrupted by a new war, in the year 798, with this people ; but it was in all probability prosecuted again after their total subjugation. Alcuin complained, that the same zeal was not shown in building up the Christian church among the Avaræs, as was manifested for the same cause among the ever-resisting Saxons ; and he traced it to the negligence with which a business is wont to be passed over, where nothing has been effected.‡

The dominion of the Franks as well as the Christian church still met with determined resistance from the numerous Sla-vonian tribes dwelling on the northern and eastern borders of Germany. It is said to have been the intention of the emperor Charles to found a metropolis of the north in Hamburg, with a view to the conversion of these tribes, and to the diffusion of Christianity throughout the entire north : but he failed to execute this plan, which was reserved for his successor.

## II. IN ASIA AND AFRICA.

WHILST a stock of nations altogether new and rude was thus gained over to Christianity, and the germ of a new spiritual creation, proceeding out of Christianity, planted in the midst

\* Quatenus bonus pastor intelligerit, non semper delinquentes dura invective castigare, sed sepe pise consolationis admonitione corriger.

† Ep. 72. Esto prædictor pietatis, non decimarum exactor.

‡ Ep. 92. Hunnotum vero, sicut dixisti, perditio, nostra est negligentia, laborantium in maledicta generatione Saxonum Deoque despiciat usque huc et eos negligentes, quæs majora mercede spud Deum et gloria apud homines habere potuimus, ut videbatur.

dangerous were threatening destruction, or a conquest on its limits, to the Christian church in countries which formed its original seat. When the Persian king, Chosru-Parviz, in the beginning of the seventh century, deprived the Roman empire of several provinces, in the year 614 conquered Palestine, and in the years 615, 616, Egypt, many Christians were killed, many carried off as slaves, or forced to unite with the Nestorian church, and many churches and monasteries destroyed.\* This, however, was but a transient evil; since, in the years 622-628, the East Roman emperor Heraclius subdued the Persian empire, and liberated the conquered provinces. But soon afterwards there rose up against the Christian church in those countries a hostile power, with which that church had to sustain a much longer and more difficult contest.

A Christianity which was already beginning to die out in meagre forms of doctrine, ceremonial rites, and superstition, bowed before the might of a new religion, striding onward with the vigour of youth, and powerfully working on the imagination; a religion which, moreover, called to its aid many physical auxiliaries,—the new religion founded by Mohammed in Arabia. In the year 610, Mohammed appeared as a prophet among the Arabian tribes, where, in the midst of prevailing idolatry, particularly Sabaisin, and of various superstitions connected with charms and amulets, the remembrance was still preserved of an original, simple, monotheistic religion; while by the numerous Jews scattered among these tribes, in part also by Christians, who possessed, however, but a very imperfect knowledge of their faith, the recollection of this primeval religion was freshly revived. Under such influences, it was quite possible, that in a man possessed of the lively temper and fiery imagination of Mohammed, the awakened consciousness of God would lead to a reaction against the idolatry in which he had been nurtured and by which he was surrounded—a reaction, however, which would be disturbed by the sensuous element so predominant in the national character of his people. Mohammed felt himself

\* See Theophanes Chronograph, f. 199, etc. Makriz. historia Coptorum Christianorum, pag. 79. Renaudot historia patriarchar. Alexandrinorum, pag. 154.

inspired with a certain zeal for the honour of the one only God, whom he had been taught by those traditions of a primitive religion, as well as by what he had learned from Judaism and Christianity, to recognize and adore. The sense of God's exaltation above all created things, of the infinite distance between the Creator and his works ; the sense of utter dependence on the Almighty and Incomprehensible — this one element of the knowledge of God — constituted the predominant ground-tone of his religious character ; whilst the other element, which belongs to the complete unfolding of the consciousness of God, the sense of relationship and communion with God, was in his case wholly suppressed. Hence his one-sided mode of apprehending the divine attributes, in which the idea of Almighty power predominated, while that of holy love was overlooked. Hence almighty power, apprehended in this religion as unlimited arbitrary will ; or if some occasional presentiment of the love and mercy of God gleamed out in the religious consciousness, yet it did not harmonize with the prevailing tone of the religion, but necessarily borrowed from the latter a certain tincture of *particularism*. Hence the predominant fatalism, and the total denial of moral liberty. And as it is the ethical shaping assumed by the idea of God which determines the whole moral spirit of a religion, hence notwithstanding the sublime maxims of morality — in contradiction, however, with the general character of the religion — that are to be found here and there scattered among the teachings of Mohammed, yet the whole system, because lacking in the main foundation of a right ethical apprehension of the idea of God, is radically defective. The God who was worshipped as an almighty and arbitrary Will, could be honoured by entire submission to his will, servile obedience, the performance of various insulated outward ceremonies, which he had seen fit to prescribe as marks of reverence to him, and by works of charity ; but also and especially, by the extermination of his enemies, the idolaters ; by the subjugation of infidels ; by the repetition of prayers ; by festivals, illustrations, and pilgrimages. Answering to that narrow apprehension of the idea of God, was the lack also, in the moral province, of that principle which, wherever it exists, pervades and ennobles every other human quality, a holy love. As the ethical element retires to such a distance in the teachings

of Mohammed, so on this very account the sense of the need of a redemption finds no place in the system. The tradition respecting an original state of the first man, and of his eating the forbidden fruit, occurs, it is true, in the Koran, as it had been derived as well from the Old and New Testaments as from apocryphal writings of Jews, or Judaizing Christians;\* but only as an isolated story—the form in which it would be likely to captivate the poetical fancy of Mohammed and his people—without reference to a great ethical truth; without connecting itself with the whole religion, so that Mohammedanism would lack nothing of its proper essence, were this story entirely expunged from its records. It belongs to the antagonism between Mohammedanism and Christianity, that the former utterly excludes the need of a redeemer and of a redemption.

It was by no means the intention of Mohammed, at the outset, to found a new religion for the entire human race; but he believed himself called, as a national prophet of the Arabians, to proclaim to his people, in their own language, and in a form suited to their wants, the same Theism of the primitive religion, which he recognized as a doctrine communicated by divine instruction, in Judaism and Christianity.† He required at first to be acknowledged only as a prophet sent to teach the Arabians, and declared hostility against none but idolaters. But when the success which crowned his first undertakings, and the enthusiasm of his followers stimulated

\* The story about Adam's exalted dignity, and the homage done to him by the angels, which Satan, who envied him, refused to pay, belongs among the Gnostic elements that are to be found in the Koran. See my *Genetische Entwicklung der Gnostischen Systeme*, p. 125, 265. *History of the church*, Vol. II. 655, 656. Geiger, in his instructive essay, *Was hat Mahomed aus dem Judenthum aufgenommen?* Bonn, 1833. p. 100, is right in not tracing this notion to the Judaism of the Old Testament, but wrong in deriving it from Christianity. More probably the source of it is a Gnostic tradition, or a still older oriental one, from which Gnosticism itself was derived.

† See the Koran, Sura xiv. f. 375 ed. Maracci—the words ascribed to the Almighty, *non misimus ullum legatum nisi cum lingua gentis sua*. How the different religions were distributed by the Almighty to different nations, through his revelations in Judaism and Christianity. Sura v. f. 226. How the revelations by Mohammed were designed for those who could not read the Old Testament and the gospels, on account of their ignorance of the language in which they were written. Sura vi. f. 262.

his imagination and his vanity to a bolder flight, and when, moreover, he became excited by the opposition he met with from Jews and Christians, he came forward with still greater pretensions, not only against idolaters, but also against Jews and Christians themselves. He declared himself a messenger divinely sent for the restoration of pure Theism, by whom it was to be freed from the foreign elements which had become incorporated with it even in Judaism and Christianity. He expressed, it is true, no hostility to the earlier revelations by Moses, the prophets, and Jesus ; but ascribed to these the same authority as he claimed for that communicated by himself ; but he attacked the pretended corruptions which had entered into those revelations. Now it was unquestionably true, that Christianity, *in the form in which it was presented to him*, might furnish abundant occasion for such a charge, respecting the corruption of its original truth ; as for example, when he rebuked the idolatrous worship of Mary and of the monks (the saints) ; and the view taken by the church of the doctrine of the Trinity might, to one who looked at it from an outward position, from the position of an abstract Monotheism, and not as a form of expressing what was contained in the Christian consciousness, easily appear as a tritheistical doctrine. Still, however, the chief reason which led Mohammed to declare hostility against Christianity certainly did not consist in these corruptions of the gospel doctrine, which he found intermingled with it, so much as it did in the relation of his own fundamental position in religion to the original and peculiar essence of Christianity itself—that fundamental position of an abstract Monotheism, placing an infinite chasm, never to be filled up, between God and his creatures, from which position a mediatorial action of God, for the purpose of bringing human nature into fellowship with himself, must appear as derogatory from the dignity of an infinitely exalted Being, and an approximation to idolatry. It was not merely a certain speculative mode of apprehending the doctrine of the Trinity, which gave offence to Mohammed as savouring of Tritheism ; but it was the essential element of Christianity itself, here lying at the bottom and constituting the ground of antagonism both to a stiff and one-sided Monotheism on the one hand, that placed God absolutely out of man, and man absolutely out of God, and to the deification

of nature that degrades and divides the consciousness of God in polytheism on the other—it was this that must remain incomprehensible to Mohammed. And hence, too, the doctrine of Christ's divinity,\* and in a word everything else in Christianity over and above the general ground-work of Theism—everything by which Christianity was essentially distinguished from the Jewish stage of religion, could not appear otherwise to Mohammed than as a corruption of primitive Christianity, as he would have it to have been. The gospel history he quotes only in the fabulous form in which it appears in the older apocryphal gospels. But even if he had had the opportunity of acquainting himself with the genuine history of Christ, still his imagination, and his poetical temperament, would have been more strongly attracted by those fantastic pictures in the apocryphal writings: and the image of Christ which these set forth, harmonized more completely with his whole religious turn of mind, than the one presented in the genuine gospels.

It is evident from these remarks, that Mohammedanism corresponds in the nearest degree with Judaism;—but a Judaism which, sundered from its connection with the theocratic development, robbed of its prevailing character, the predominating idea of God's holiness,—of its prophetic element and its peculiar luminous point, the animating idea of the Messiah, was degraded from the historical, to the mythical, form, and accommodated to the national character of the Arabians. And here we may notice an important law relating to the progressive development of the kingdom of God in humanity. Just as, *within the church itself*, a Judaism ennobled by Christianity and permeated by its spirit, or a Christianity in Jewish form (the Catholicism of the middle ages) formed for the converted barbarous nations a medium of transition to the appropriation of a Christianity expressing in essence and form its true character; so *without the pale of the church*, a Judaism degraded to the level of natural religion in Mo-

\* In the final judgment God, according to the Koran, shall say to Jesus: O Jesu, fili Marie, tunc dixisti hominibus: accipite me et matrem meam in duos Deos propter Deum? And Jesus shall call God to witness, that he had never taught so: Non dixi eis, nisi quod præcepisti mihi: colite Deum dominum meum et dominum vestrum. Sura v. f. 236.

hammedanism, formed a theistic medium of transition from idolatry, at its very lowest stages, to the only genuine theism of Christianity fully developed and pervading the entire life.

In respect to the relation of Christianity to Mohammedanism, as it was understood by Christian teachers among the Mohammedans in the eighth century, we find that their apologetic writings—so far as we can form a judgment of them from the fragments still preserved in the works of John of Damascus and his scholar Theodore Abukara, both belonging to the eighth century,\*—relate particularly to the doctrines of free-will and of the divinity of Christ. In seeking to defend the doctrine of free self-determination and moral responsibility against the Mohammedan principle, whereby good and evil were derived alike from the divine causality, and the distinction between a permission and an actual efficiency on the part of God † was denied, men fell, as usual, when combating one extreme, into directly the opposite, namely, into an anthropopathical mode of apprehending the relation of God to his creatures, that led to Pelagianism, without being aware of the consequences flowing from this view of the matter. God, having once completed the work of creation, exerted no further creative power, but left the universe to go on and shape itself according to the laws therein established,—everything, by virtue of the creative word which God spake in the beginning, unfolding itself spontaneously out of the seminal principles clothed by God with their several specific powers.‡

The schisms subsisting among the oriental Christians, the

\* The dialogue between the Christian and the Turk, by John of Damascus, T. I. in his works ed. le Quien, f. 466. Galland. bibl. patrum, T. XIII. f. 272; and the *ἰεράτειος καὶ ἀποκοίνων* between the *Βασιλεῖος* and the *Χριστιανός* of Theodore Abukara in *Bibliotheca patrum Parisiens*. Tom. XI. f. 431. It is difficult to decide which was the original form of this dialogue, and which of the two was its author.

† The Mohammedan, disputing with the Christian καὶ ἀνθεπτον, on the question was it God's will, or not, that Christ should be crucified?

‡ Ἰδοὺ ἵγεις αὐτοῖς ὁρῶς ἐστι τοῖς παλαιοῖς, ἐτοῖς κακοῖς, ὅπου ταῦτα στηλῶν, καὶ

πλάττεις καὶ ἰσγάζεις πειθῶντες τὴν προτὴν ἀμύνην, τὰ πάντα πεινάντες. Theodor. Abukara. l. c. f. 432.

dissatisfaction of the oppressed schismatic party (in Egypt and Syria) with the Byzantine government and the reigning church, would naturally tend to promote the triumphant advance of the Mohammedan Saracens ; and these were inclined, from motives of policy, to manifest special favour to the hitherto persecuted parties, such as were the numerous Monophysite party in Egypt and the Nestorian party in Syria.\* Wherever the Saracens, in the course of the seventh and eight centuries, obtained the ascendancy in Asia (Syria and the countries adjacent) and in North-Africa, they forbore indeed to persecute the old Christian inhabitants on account of their faith, if they paid the tribute imposed on them ; yet there was no lack of extortions, oppressions, and insults, and the fanatical temper of the rulers might easily be excited to deeds of violence.† Moreover, they who in ignorance were depending on a dead faith, might be led by various inducements to abandon their creed for a religion which was spreading with the fresh vigour of youth, which flattered the inclinations of the natural man, and which was favoured by the ruling powers.

The Nestorian communities, established in Eastern Asia, which were favoured by the Persians, and afterwards, for the same reason, by their Mohammedan rulers, were best qualified for labouring to promote the extension of Christianity in this quarter of the world ; and in fact we observed, in the preceding period, that from Persia, Christian colonies have gone to different parts of India. Timotheus, the patriarch of the Nestorians in Syria, who filled this post from 778 to 820,‡ took a special interest in the establishment of missions. He sent monks from the monastery of Beth-ahe in Mesopotamia, as missionaries among the tribes dwelling in the districts of

\* The major part of the population in Egypt, the Copts, were inclined to Monophysitism ; and these assisted the conquerors in driving out the descendants of the Greeks, who, as followers of the doctrines that prevailed in the empire, were called Melchites. All the churches were now transferred to the former, and the Coptic patriarchate was founded. See the accounts of Macrizi, which especially deserve to be studied on the subject of Egypt. Historia Coptorum Christianorum, ed. Wetzer, 1828. pp. 88, 89. Renaudot, Historia Patriarcharum Alexandrinorum. P. 2.

† Particulars in Macrizi, Renaudot, and Theophanes.

‡ See Assemani bibliotheca oriental. T. III. P. I. f. 158. ff. III.

the Caspian sea, and beyond them to India, and even to China. Among these were two active men, Cardag and Jabdallaha, whom he ordained bishops.\* Jabdallaha drew up for the patriarch a report of the happy results of the mission ; and the patriarch clothed them with full powers to ordain, where it should be found necessary, several of the monks as bishops. He expressly directed, that for the present, in order to conform to the rule requiring three bishops to assist at the ordination of another, a book of the gospels should take the place of the third. A certain David is named as the bishop ordained for China.† According to an inscription, published by the Jesuits, and purporting to belong to the year 782,‡ in the Chinese-Syrian tongue, Olopuen, a Nestorian priest, visited this empire in the year 635, from the eastern provinces bordering on the west of China, and laboured successfully as a missionary ; and it is said that Christianity, amid many persecutions at first, but favoured at length by the emperors, was still more widely diffused. But even if this inscription cannot be considered as genuine,§ it still remains certain, from the notices above stated, that in this period, attempts were made by the Nestorians to pave the way for the entrance of Christianity into Eastern Asia, and even into China.

Under the emperor Justinian, Christianity had found entrance from Egypt into Nubia.|| In Nubia a Christian em-

\* L. c. f. 163.

† Ibn-Wahab, an Arabian, who travelled to China in the ninth century, found at the emperor's court an image of Christ and images of the apostles, and he heard the emperor say that Christ discharged the office of a teacher thirty months. See travels of an Arabian of the ninth century, in Renaudot's *Anciennes Relations des Indes et de la Chine*, p. 68. Comp. Ritter's *Asia*, Vol. I. p. 286.

‡ Printed with others in Mosheim, *Hist. Eccles. Tartarorum*, Appendix N. III.

§ The controversy about the genuineness of this inscription is still undecided, and, in the present condition of our knowledge of Chinese literature, so it must remain. A very important authority in this department of learning, though perhaps not perfectly free from all bias on the point in question, has already declared in favour of its genuineness. See Abel Rémusat, *Mélanges Asiatiques*, T. I. p. 36. Professor Neumann, from whom we may expect a more full investigation of this subject, takes the other side.

|| See the declaration of a Christian prince of Nubia touching the in-

ire was founded, as in Abyssinia, and the churches of the two kingdoms recognized the Coptic patriarch in Egypt as their head, and had their bishops ordained by him.\*

cription ; and remarks on the introduction of Christianity into Nubia, in *Étienne Matériaux pour l'hist. du Christianisme en Egypte, en Nubie, et en Abyssinie.* Paris, 1832.

\* See Renaudot, Hist. Patriarch. Alex. p. 178 and in other places. A fact worthy of notice is the connection of the Christians of India with the Coptic patriarchs. See Renaudot, p. 188. Makrizi, p. 93. It were singular, indeed, that these Christians should have preferred resorting to Egypt rather than to their mother church in Persia ; and hence we might be led to conjecture that some Ethiopian tribe was really meant, but in this connection such a supposition has also its difficulties.

## SECTION SECOND.

### HISTORY OF THE CHURCH CONSTITUTION.

#### I. RELATION OF THE CHURCH TO THE STATE.

IT is true, that along with Christianity, the entire church fabric, with all its regulations, as it had thus far shaped itself, passed over to the newly converted nations. The whole appeared to them as one divine foundation ; and at the stage of culture in which Christianity found them, they were but little capable of distinguishing and separating the divine from the human, the inward from the outward, the unchangeable from the changeable. But, as a matter of course, the church fabric which had shaped itself under entirely different circumstances, must, in accommodating itself to these altogether new relations, undergo various changes. First, as regards the relation of the church to the state, it was for the advancement of the church, and the attainment of its ends, in promoting the culture of the nations, a matter of great importance, that it should be preserved independent in its course of development, and protected against the destructive influences of a barbarous secular power. The encroachments of the arbitrary will of barbarous princes would be no less dangerous here, than the encroachments of the arbitrary will of the corrupt Byzantine court at the stage of over-civilization. The Frankish princes were often as slow as the Byzantine emperors to acknowledge the fact, that within their own states there was a province to which their sovereign power did not extend, an authority wholly independent of their own.\* But on the other hand, they were

\* The Frankish monarch Chilperic, in the sixth century, who took it into his head to add several letters to the Latin alphabet, and to direct that the boys in the schools of his empire should all be taught to read and write accordingly, and that all the old books should be rubbed over with pumice-stone and recopied according to this alphabet, would certainly be very likely to act over again the part of a Justinian in his

## OPPOSITION TO SOVEREIGN POWER.

checked by the faith in a visible theocracy, represented by the church; which principle, closely connected, especially in the Western church, with the idea of the sacerdotal dignity, had long since been fully established, and was transmitted to these nations at the same time with Christianity. This principle was also better suited to their stage of culture, than the faith in an invisible church, and its power working outwardly from within. The untutored mind, when struck with religious impressions, was inclined to see, to reverence, and to fear God himself in the visible church, in the persons of the priests. This point of view, in which the church presented itself, would be favoured by its whole relation to these races; for it appeared, in fact, as the one perfect organism of human society, and as the fountain-head of all culture for the untutored nations. It alone could, by the reverence which it inspired for a divine power, present a counterpoise to barbarous force and arbitrary will. But whilst, on the one hand, the impression of reverence towards the church, as God's representative, was capable of exerting a mighty influence on the minds of rulers; so too, on the other hand, there was tremendous force in the consciousness of absolute authority, and in the violence of suddenly-excited passions, which in rude men was the less likely to be controlled. Many conflicting elements must therefore necessarily arise under these circumstances; and the theocratical church system, which alone, under such a state of things, could maintain the independence of the church, even in respect to its own internal development.

conduct towards the church; and what would have followed, had not the monarch of this character been obliged to yield to the superior power of an independent church? He composed, in the year 580, a small tract, combating the distinction of three persons in the Trinity, in which he maintained that it was beneath the dignity of God to be called a person, like a mortal man. He seems to have framed for himself a Samosatenean or Sabellian doctrine of the Trinity. He appeals to the Old Testament as making mention of but one God, who appeared to the prophets and patriarchs, and who revealed the law. This tract he had read in his presence to Gregory, bishop of Tours, and then said to him—"It is my will that you, and the other teachers of the churches, should believe thus." He supposed he understood this doctrine better than the fathers of the church, whose authority was quoted against him. Yet the decided manner in which he was opposed by Gregory and other bishops, who rested on the authority of the church traditions, induced him to desist from his purpose. See *Gregor. Turonens. Hist. Francor. L. V. c. 45.*

had no other way to shape itself out but in conflict with a secular power which often resisted it.

The princes of the Frankish empire in particular, acquired the greatest influence over the church in a quarter where it would be precisely the most injurious to her interests, and most directly calculated to render her wholly dependent on the secular power, viz., in the nomination of bishops, who, according to the existing church polity, had the entire governance of the church in their hands; so that, if by the manner in which they obtained their places, they became subservient to the princes, the mischievous consequences of this their servility would affect the whole administration of church affairs. In the old Roman empire, the influence of the emperors had only extended, and that too chiefly in the East, to the filling up of the vacant bishoprics in the most important cities. But to the princes of whom we now speak, it appeared a strange matter, that such considerable posts within the circle of their own empire, and with which, sometimes, so large revenues and important political privileges were connected, should be conferred without consultation with them; and the clergy themselves, who sought to obtain bishoprics through the influence of the princes, contributed to increase this influence of the latter, and to confirm them in the belief that they were entitled to it. Thus in the Frankish empire, under the successors of Clovis, the ancient regulation respecting ecclesiastical elections went entirely into disuse, or, where it was preserved, the Frankish princes did not consider themselves bound by it; if they wished to supply vacancies in some other way. The old church laws with regard to the *interstitia*, the stages through which candidates must rise to the higher spiritual offices, and against the immediate elevation of a layman from secular employments to such offices,—these laws, which had maintained their force in the Western church still more than in the East, even though re-enacted there by synods,\* were yet in practice no longer regarded. The princes bestowed the bishoprics arbitrarily on their favourites, or sold them to the highest bidders, or to those, who, without so open a resort to simony, made them tempting presents.† Hence, naturally, it often happened, that un-

\* See the third Council of Orléans, A.D. 532, c. vi.

† Gregory of Tours states, in his life of Gallus, bishop of Aversa

worthy persons were nominated to the bishoprics, while worthy ones were deposed.\* The only good result was, that still in many cases, the character which an individual had acquired by his past life, the reputation in which he stood as a saint, had more influence with the princes than the presents and the intrigues of the bad.

It is true, laws were, from the first, passed against these encroachments on the ecclesiastical elections;† but those in power did not allow themselves to be bound by them. The

(Clermont), *vite patrum*, c. vi. f. 1171, ed. Ruinart, that the clergy of Clermont came with *many presents* before Theodoric, one of the sons and successors of Clovis, hoping to persuade him to confirm the choice made by themselves; and Gregory observes, with regard to this incident—“*Jam tunc german illud iniquum cœperat fructificare, ut sacerdotium aut venderetur a regibus aut compararetur a clericis.*” The king, however, did not allow himself, in this case, to be influenced by the presents, but bestowed the bishopric on Gallus, a deacon, highly respected and venerated on account of his previous life; and he caused a feast to be made in the city, at the public expense, in honour of the new bishop, that all might take joy in his appointment. And so common was the practice of simony, either of the grosser or of the more refined sort, that Gallus was in the habit of jocosely remarking, he had paid for his bishopric but one trias (the third part of an avar), his *bonne main* to the cook who waited at the table. So, too (in l. IV. c. 35, hist. Frangor.), it is mentioned as the common means of obtaining a bishopric: *Offerre multa, plurima promittere.*

\* So it happened after the death of the Gallus above mentioned. A certain archdeacon Cratinus, an intemperate, avaricious man, obtained the office by help of the princes, while Crato, a presbyter, who, though excessively given to spiritual pride, had been tried in every stage of the clerical office, and had distinguished himself by the faithful discharge of its duties, and a kindly regard for the welfare of the poor, and who had, moreover, the voice of the church, the clergy, and the bishops in his favour, was set aside. He afterwards distinguished himself again by remaining in the city, when deserted by the bishop and many of the other clergy, on account of a fatal sickness (the *lues inguinaria*) which raged in France about the middle of the sixth century. Here he attended to the burial of the dead, held masses for each and all, till at length, falling himself a sacrifice to the plague, he died in the discharge of his duty. See Gregor. hist. l. IV. c. xi., &c.

† Thus, for example, Concil. Avernense, A.D. 535, c. ii. In order to the regularity of a choice, was required *electio clericorum vel civium et consensus metropolitani*; and of the candidate it is said, *non patrocinia potentum adhibeat, non calliditate subdola ad conscribendum decretum alios hortetur præmis, alios timore compellat*; and Concil. Aurelianense V. 549, c. 10, *ut nulli episcopatum præmis aut comparatione liceat adi-pisci, sed cum voluntate regis juxta electionem cleri ac plebis.*

third council of Paris, in 557, endeavoured once more to suppress these abuses ; directing, in their eighth canon, that the election of bishops should proceed from the communities and the clergy, with the concurrence of the provincial bishops and of the metropolitan ; that whoever came to such office in a way not agreeing with these conditions, by a command of the king, should not be recognized as their colleague by the bishops of the province.\* Conformably with this decree, a synod at Xaintes (Santones), convened in 564, under Leontius, archbishop of Bordeaux (Burdelaga), as metropolitan, pronounced sentence of deposition on Emeritus, the bishop of the former place, because he had obtained his office by a command of the deceased king Clotaire, without a regular church election, and they had the courage to elect another in his place ; but Charibert, the then reigning king over this portion of the Frankish empire was highly incensed at this decree, which the synod caused to be laid before him by a presbyter, as their delegate. "Thinkest thou," said he, angrily to the delegate, "that of Clotaire's sons none has been left behind to take care that his father's will shall not be defeated?" He ordered the delegate to be conveyed out of the city on a waggon filled with thorns, and condemned him to banishment from the country ; he also fined the members of the synod in a sum proportioned to their several ranks, and replaced Emeritus in his post.† The Roman bishop, Gregory the Great, was indefatigable in exhorting the Frankish bishops and princes to remove this abuse, whose injurious effects on the church he explained to them in detail, and strenuously urged them to appoint a synod for this purpose.‡ "We are deeply grieved," he writes in one of these letters, "when we find money having anything to do in the disposing of the offices of the church, and that which is holy becoming secular. He who would purchase such

\* Nullus civibus invitis ordinetur episcopus, nisi quem populi et clericorum electio plenissima quæsierit voluntate, non principis imperio neque per quamlibet conditionem contra metropolis voluntatem vel episcoporum comprovincialium ingeratur. Quodsi per ordinacionem regiam honoris istius culmen pervadere aliquis nimia temeritate presumiserit, a comprovincialibus loci ipsius episcopus recipi nullatenus mereatur, quem indebet ordinatum agnoscunt.

† See Gregor. Turon. Hist. Francor. I. IV c. 26.

‡ See his Letters, lib. XI. ep. 58, and the following, lib. IX. ep. 106.

places, desires not the office, but only the name, of a priest, to gratify his vanity. What is the consequence, except that no further regard is paid to life and manners, he only being considered the worthy candidate who has money to pay? He who merely, for the sake of the honour, is eager after an office meant for use, is but the more unworthy of it, because he seeks the honour." The fifth synod of Paris, in 615, actually renewed, in their first canon, the ordinance respecting free church elections, and king Clotaire II. confirmed this law, yet with such provisoes, as left abundant exceptions; for a power was reserved to the princes of examining into the worthiness of those elected, and of directing their ordination accordingly. The case was also supposed possible, that the monarch might choose a bishop directly from his court.\* And although this synodal law had been unconditionally confirmed by the king, yet it was still far from being the case, that the monarchs were determined by it in their conduct. Boniface found these abuses connected with the filling up of vacant offices still prevailing; and although he might, by his great personal influence, do something towards counteracting them, yet the relations could not in this way be permanently altered. Among the things done by Charlemagne for bettering the condition of the church, belongs the restoration of free church elections;† in which, however, the power of confirmation remained tacitly reserved in the monarch. Yet the succeeding history shows that between the law and its fulfilment an immense interval still remained. In the English and in the Spanish church, the princes exercised, it is true, on the whole, no such direct influence on the filling up of vacant bishoprics, but even in these churches their acquiescence was held to be necessary.

Again, the state, under the new relations, obtained a certain share in ecclesiastical legislation. In the old Roman empire,

\* Si persona condigna fuerit, per ordinationem principis ordinetur, *vel* certe si de palatio eligitur, per meritum personae et doctrinæ ordinetur.

† The capitulary of the year 803. "Ut sancta ecclesia suo liberius potiretur honore, ad sensum ordinii ecclesiastico præbuiimus, ut episcopi per electionem cleri et populi secundum statuta canonum de propria diocesi remota personarum et munierum acceptione ob virtute meritum et sapientiae donum elegantur, ut exemplo et verbo sibi subjectis usque quaque prodesse valeant."

the secular power had exercised an influence only on the general church assemblies—the provincial synods were left ~~to~~ themselves. But in the new states, men found it difficult to enter into the conception of a double legislation; and besides, the church required the civil power to carry a part of its own laws into execution, such, namely, as related to the suppression of pagan customs, penance, the observance of Sunday, &c. Hence it happened that the synods, which should have guided the church legislation, were convened after consultation with the princes;\* that the latter assisted at them, and their decrees were published under the royal authority. Finally, the synods became confounded with the general assemblies, at which the princes, with their noble vassals, were used to draw up the civil laws, and ecclesiastical and civil laws were drawn up at ~~one~~ and the same time. Thus, in the Frankish kingdom, till far into the eighth century, the assemblies of the bishops for purely ecclesiastical purposes becoming continually less frequent, at length went into entire desuetude—a result to which the internal political contests and disorders, and the indifference of such multitudes of worldly-minded bishops, no doubt, greatly contributed. Already the abbot Columban, in his letter to the bishops convened on account of their quarrel with him, complains that synods were no longer held, though he admits that in the turbulence of those times they could not be convened so frequently as formerly.† Gregory the Great‡ was obliged to apply to the Frankish princes and bishops for the convening of a synod to devise measures for the removal of ecclesiastical abuses; and, as we have already remarked on a former page, Boniface found occasion to complain that no synod had been held for so long a time. But even in the synods held by him, the most considerable men of the nation took a part, and along with the ecclesiastical laws, others also

\* See the ordinance of the Frankish king Sigebert ad Desiderium episcopum Cadurcensem, bishop of Cahors, A.D. 650, ut sine nostra scientia synodale concilium in regno nostro non agatur. Baluz. Capitular T. I. f. 143.

† In reference to the convocation then held. “utinam sepius hoc ageretis, et licet juxta canones senet aut bis in anno pro tumultuosis hujus aevi dissensionibus semper sic servare vos non vacat, quamvis rarius potissimum hoc debuit vobis inesse studium, quo negligentes quique timorem haberent et studiosi ad maiorem provocarentur profectum.”

‡ See the letter above referred to

were passed by them having no relation to ecclesiastical affairs. In like manner, under king Pipin and the emperor Charlemagne, it continued to be the prevailing custom for ecclesiastical and civil laws to be drawn up at the same time at their great national assemblies; though it was still the fact, that, in particular cases, assemblies purely ecclesiastical were held, which, however, were convened by the princes. Now by this union the bishops, it is true, who took part in these general legislative assemblies, obtained some influence on civil legislation and on the institutions of civil society; but this influence fell to their share not merely by accident and by reason of the circumstances above described, but the whole form under which the Theocratic system was contemplated carried along with it the necessity of their having such influence. As, on the one hand, the church needed the arm of the civil power to carry a part of their laws into effect, so, on the other, the civil power needed that sanction from the church, and that commanding authority which the latter had to offer, in order to maintain itself against rude arbitrary will, and to place a check on barbarian insolence. The feeling of this want was, no doubt, a universal one, for it proceeded from the character of the social condition of the people, and the prevailing turn of their religious way of thinking. It was, however, an effect of peculiar circumstances that, in the Visigothic empire in Spain, this feeling asserted itself with peculiar force; for the successors of Reckared, the first Catholic king of Spain, were obliged to resort to the authority of the church as a substitute for the sanction which they wanted—a right to the throne by the law of inheritance, and as a means of securing them against the spirit of revolt. Many of the Spanish synods in the seventh century made a point of conceding this to the royal authority. Thus, for example, the sixteenth council of Toledo, in 693, declared that every one was bound to preserve inviolate the fidelity they had vowed, next after God, to the king, as his vice-gerent; \* and, appealing to passages from the Old Testament, not very applicable, indeed, to a purely gospel economy,† they declared kings to be the

\* Post Deum regibus, utpote jure vicario ab eo præelectis, fidem promissam quenque inviolabili cordis intentione servare.

† According to which, Jesus alone is the anointed of the Lord, or through him all believers alike are become the anointed of the Lord.

inviolable anointed ones of God. Hence in this Spanish church the regulation was also brought about, whereby all checks of the secular power on the church were to be avoided, and the latter only was to be secured in its efficient influence on the state, which needed its sanctifying power; for the seventeenth council of Toledo decreed, in 694, that in the first three days of each such meeting only spiritual affairs should be transacted by the clergy alone, and afterwards civil. To the emperor Charles, who, with his more independent judgment, was more inclined to separate ecclesiastical affairs from political,\* it seemed expedient that the bishops, abbots, and comites should divide themselves, at these general assemblies, into three several chambers, and each attend to the affairs belonging to them—the bishops to the affairs of the church, the abbots to all that related more particularly to the monastic life, and the counts to the political affairs. So it was done at the council of Mentz in 813. The ordinances of every kind, however, were published under the imperial authority.

As it regards the exemption of the church from state burdens, the older laws respecting this matter also passed over to the new state of things: they had to undergo, however, of course, in these new circumstances, many changes in their application. The incompatibility of the spiritual office with military service was, indeed, universally acknowledged in the preceding period; yet it had been held necessary at the same time to adopt certain precautionary measures against the reception of such into the spiritual order as were liable to such service,† and even at the commencement of *this* period the

\* See the capitulary of the year 811, c. 4. *Discutiendum est, in quantum se episcopus aut abbas et alii seculari:ibus debeat inserere vel in quantum Comes vel alter laicus in ecclesiastica negotia. His interrogandum est acutissime. quid sit, quod apostolus ait: "Nemo militans Deo implicat se negotiis secularibus."* 2 Tim. ii. vel ad quos sermo iste pertineat. See Baluz. Capitular. T. I. f. 478.

† Gregory considered it altogether just and proper that no countenance should be given to the practice of passing immediately from civil and military to spiritual offices (which was still customary in the East), because such a transition easily excited the suspicion of worldly motives, *quia qui secularem habitum deserens, ad ecclesiastica officia venire festinat, mutare vult seculum, non relinquere.* But it seemed to him contrary to the interest of piety that the abandoning of these offices with a view to embrace the monastic life should likewise be forbidden, since in this case no such suspicion could arise. He refers to his own experience for ex-

emperor Maurice involved himself in a quarrel with the Roman bishop Gregory the Great, by the enactment of some such restrictive law. But in the new states greater difficulty must be experienced in this quarter, because the obligation to do military service did not fall on particular classes of the citizens alone, but on all freemen. True, men felt how incompatible it was with the spiritual calling for the clergy to take any part in war; but it was sought to secure the interests of the state by a law that no person should be allowed to enter into a spiritual or monastic order without permission from the supreme authority.\* The church now saw itself reduced to the necessity of selecting members for the spiritual order from *that* class who were not affected by the obligation to do military service, namely, the *bond-men*. Besides, among these there was often less rudeness of manners; and bishops who were disposed to exercise a despotic lordship over their clergy, could more easily secure their object when they had among this body a number of the bond-men who were held as the property of the church. This plan was so often resorted to that it became necessary to check the wide extension of the practice by particular ordinances, yet without forbidding the thing itself. Thus the fourth council of Toledo, in the year 633, can. 74, decreed that it was unquestionably allowable to place in the parishes priests and deacons created from the bond-men of the church, provided only they were such as recommended themselves by their life and manners, and that they had been first restored to freedom. In the rule approved by the council of Aix in 816, and published by Chrodegang, bishop of Metz, we find the following singular remark, from which also it is seen that bond-men were often consecrated to the clerical office without being enfranchised: †—“ Many select their

amples of honest conversions of this kind: *Ego scio, quanti his diebus meis in monasterio milites conversi miracula fecerunt, signa et virtutes operati sunt.* I. III. ep. 65 et 66.

\* Concil. Aurelianense I., under king Clovis, A.D. 511, c. 4, *ut nullus secularium ad clericatus officium presumatur, nisi aut cum regis iussione aut cum judicis voluntate.* The capitulary of Charlemagne, A.D. 805, c. 15, Baluz. T. I. f. 427. *De liberis hominibus, qui ad servitium Dei se tradere volunt, ut prius hoc non faciant, quam a nobis licentiam postulant.* In the latter law the object is stated; that it is designed only against such as were desirous of this from impure motives, and not *devotionis causa.*

† See can. 119.

clergy exclusively from the bond-men of the church, and they seem to adopt this course because such persons, when injured by them, or deprived of the salary due to them, cannot complain from fear of being subjected to corporal punishment, or of being reduced again to servile labour.\* Yet it was added—this is not said because we think it wrong that men of reputable life should be taken from the class of bond-men, especially since with God there is no respect of persons; but we say it, that, for the reason assigned, no prelate may take for his clergy persons of the lower class alone to the exclusion of all of higher rank.” Thus the bishops were led by their own interest to help in promoting the object which Christianity had aimed at from the first, and to restore an excluded class to the enjoyment of their common rights as men, although, for the most part, it was not the *Christian spirit* that moved them to this as it should have done of itself.

And here we may take occasion to glance backward upon what had been thus far done by Christianity in this regard. From the beginning and onward Christianity—not, indeed, by any sudden outward change, but by its secret influences on the modes of thinking and feeling—had prepared a transformation of this relation which is so repugnant to the common worth and dignity of man.† It was the new ideas of the image of God in every human creature; of the redemption destined alike for all; of its higher fellowship of life—the fellowship of God’s kingdom, embracing all without any distinction of earthly relations of life, slaves as well as freemen: it was these ideas by which the prevailing mode of regarding the relation of this class of men, their rights and the duties owed to them, was changed, and the way prepared for a milder treatment of them. The more respectable church-teachers of the fourth and fifth centuries speak with decision and emphasis on this subject. In the manumission of slaves the church was especially called upon to lend her assistance, and thus it was acknowledged that such a proceeding was especially suited to the position of the church. Frequently slaves were set free in

\* Timentes scilicet, ne aut severissimis verberibus affiantur aut humanae servituti denuo crudeliter addicantur.

† Church History, Vol. I. p. 267; my Denkwürdigkeiten Bd. II. p. 253 f.; and my Chrysostom Bd. I. p. 376 f. Compare Dr. Möhler’s essay in the Theologischen Quartal-Schrift, Jahrgang 1834, 1 H.

order that they may become monks, and this was regarded as a pious work. At an early period, too, many, especially of the Oriental monks, declared themselves opposed to this whole relation as repugnant to the dignity of the image of God in all men. Thus the abbot Isidore of Pelusium, in writing to a person of rank, with whom he is interceding in behalf of one of his slaves,\* said he could hardly credit it, that a friend of Christ, who had experienced that grace which bestowed freedom on all, would still own slaves. It is related of Johannes Eleemosynarius, who from 606 to 616 was patriarch of Alexandria, that he called together those persons who treated their slaves with cruelty and addressed them as follows:—“ God has not given us servants that we may beat them, but that they may serve us; but perhaps even not for this purpose, but that they may receive out of the abundance which God has bestowed on us the means of sustenance; for tell me, what price can man pay to purchase him who was created after the likeness of God, and thus honoured by God? Hast thou, who art his master, a single member more to thy body, or hast thou a different soul? Is he not, in all things, thy equal? Do ye not hear what the great light of the church, the Apostle Paul says—‘ For as many of you as are baptized, they have put on Christ?’ Here is neither bond nor free, for ye are all one in Christ. If, then, before Christ we are all equal, let us also be equal among ourselves; for Christ took on him the form of a servant to teach us that we ought not to be proud toward our servants, since we all have one master, even him who dwells in heaven and looks down on the lowly; Pray what is the gold we pay for the right to subject to us as our servant him who, equally with ourselves, has been honoured by our Lord, and, with us, redeemed by His blood? For his sake, heaven, earth, and sea, and all that therein is, were created. It is true, also, that angels minister to him; on his account Christ washed his disciples’ feet; on his account Christ was crucified, and for his sake did he suffer everything else. But thou abusest him who has been thus honoured of God, and treatest him with as little mercy as if thou hadst not one and the same nature in common with him! ” Next, if he learned that this rebuke failed of its intended effect, and that

\* Οὐ γὰρ εῖμεν εἰκίτην ἵχυν τὸν φιλόχοιτον εἰδότα τὴν χάριν τὴν πάντας εἰλικρίτασσαν.

the slave was still treated no better, he purchased him himself and set him at liberty.\* The Oriental monks were generally agreed in the principle never to use the service of slaves, partly because they considered it as belonging to their calling to perform for each other those services which were usually done by slaves, partly because they believed themselves bound to respect the image of God in all men.† When, near the close of the eighth century, the famous Greek monk Plato retired from the world, he manumitted his slaves,‡ and after that refused to permit any slave to wait on him in the monastery.§ These principles were propagat'd by his disciple and friend the famous Theodorus Studita, at Constantinople. The latter directs his disciple, the abbot Nicolaus, || not to employ men, created in the image of God, as slaves, either in h's own service, or in that of the monastery under his care, or in the labour of the fields, for this was permitted to seculars alone. In his last will, also, he gave directions to the same effect.¶ The Roman bishop Gregory the Great, in manumitting two slaves, introduced the subject in a deed drawn up for this purpose, with the following words:\*\*\*—“As our Saviour, the author of all created beings, was willing for this reason to take upon him the nature of man, that he might free us, by his grace, from the chains of bondage in which we were enthralled, and restore us to our original freedom; so a good and salutary thing is done when men, whom nature from the beginning created free, and whom the law of nations has subjected to the yoke of servitude, are presented again with the freedom in which they were born.”†† Among the rude Franks the

\* See the life of Johannes Eleemosyn. by Leontius, translated by Anastasius in the *Actis Sanctorum Januar.* T. II. s. 61, f. 510.

† Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury (see above), says, in his *Capitul. c. 8, Graecorum monachi servos non habent, Romani habent.*

‡ See the account of his life, composed by his scholar, the famous Theodorus Studita, in his works published by Sirmond, or in the *Actis Sanctorum April.* T. I. appendix f. 47, s. 8.

§ S. 23, l. c. *πῶς γαρ ἀν μηνάστης ἀλίτην, οὐ διεκτικας φόβον δούλοις ἵταντινίπετος;* || L. I. ep. 10.

¶ See opp. Theodori in Sirmond. opp. T. V. f. 66.

\*\* L. VI. ep. 12.

†† The same Gregory writes, in reference to a woman held as a slave, but who was discovered to be freeborn, and restored to her rights as such: *Quod revelante Deo libertatis auctore approbata sit liberta, l. VII., ep. 1.*

slaves had much to suffer from cruel masters; but in the churches, as well as with the priests, they in some cases found relief.\* The asylum of the churches was to serve especially for the protection of such slaves as fled from the cruelty of their masters. Such an one was restored to his owner only on condition the latter promised, on his oath, to spare him from bodily punishment; and if the master broke his promise, he was expelled from the communion of the church.† Among the works of pious charity were reckoned especially the redemption and manumission of slaves, whereby laymen and monks, who stood in high reputation for their piety, distinguished themselves; but at the present time the bishops were led, by an oftentimes selfish policy,‡ sometimes to liberate slaves in order to adopt them into the number of their clergy, sometimes to give them ordination without releasing them from their previous obligation. At all events, this class of men could not fail thereby to be placed in an advantageous light before the eyes of the people. When in the rule of Chrodegang, and at the church assembly of Aix, a resolution was made against the exclusive adoption of bondmen into the spiritual order, an express clause was inserted, as we have already remarked, to guard against the mistaken view, that these men

\* Gregory of Tours, in his history (V. lib. III.) cites the example of a servant and maid belonging to a cruel master, who had won each other's affections. They finally went to the priest, and were married. Their master, as soon as he was informed of this, hurried to the church, and required them to be given up. The priest, reminding him of the respect due to the church, refused to give them up except on condition he promised not to dissolve the connection just formed, and not to inflict upon them any personal harm. The cruel and cunning master promised equivocally that they should not be separated, and deceived the priest. He caused them, both together, to be buried alive. As soon as the priest heard of this, he hastened to the master, nor did he leave him till he consented that both should be dug up again; but the young man only was saved, the woman was suffocated.

† Concil. Epaonense, A.D. 517, c. 39: *Servus reatu atrociore culparibilis si ad ecclesiam confugerit, a corporalibus tantum suppliciis excusetur.* Concil. V. Aurelianense, A.D. 549, c. 22. Of the master who breaks his word, sit ab omnium communione suspensus.

‡ In the monasteries, also, many slaves were received as monks;—whence the law of the emperor Charles in the capitulary of the year 805, c. xi. Baluz. T. I. f. 423. *De propriis servis vel ancillis non supra modum in monasteria sumantur. ne deserentur villaæ* (that there might be no want of persons to cultivate the land).

were to be considered unworthy, on account of their descent, of being received into the spiritual order; as if the dignity of men and Christians were not to be recognized in all alike.

The possessions and wealth\* of the church, especially in landed estates, increased greatly under the new relations. It was not a pious sympathy alone in the cause of the church, but superstition also which contributed to this increase. Men believed that by making gifts and legacies to the churches they did a work of peculiar merit, which would atone for their sins; as is shown by the oft-occurring phrases, *pro remissione peccatorum, pro redemtione animarum.*† But then, again, these possessions were thus rendered the more insecure,‡ being exposed to the covetous desires and forcible contributions of the nobles and princes, against whom the donors sought to protect themselves by terrible forms of execration inserted in the deeds of gift, and by stories and legends touching the punishment of sacrilege. The landed estates of the church in the Frankish empire were for the most part liable to be taxed in the same manner as all property belonging to the old land proprietors; perhaps, however, with the exception, from the beginning, of a smaller portion considered

\* Among the new sources of wealth to the church, belonged also the obligation imposed on the laity to pay tithes. The confounding together of the state of things under the Old and under the New Testament, had already led the ecclesiastical authority, in occasional instances, to require of the laity that they should consecrate, in the name of God, the tenth part of their goods to God and the priests. Thus, for example, the letter of the bishop of Tours in the year 567: "Illi vero instantissime commonetur, ut Abrahæ documenta sequentes decimas ex omni facultate non pigeat Deo pro reliquis, quæ possidetis, conservandis offerre, ne sibi ipsi inopiam generet, qui parva non tribuit, et plura retinet." But the emperor Charles was the first who, moved by this requisition, derived from the Old Testament, made the payment of tithes legally binding. In enacting this law, he still met with much opposition. We have seen above how Alcuin expressed himself on this subject. See p. 226 and the following.

† Chilperic, king of the Franks, often complained: *Ecce pauper remansit fiscus noster, ecce divitiae nostræ ad ecclesiæ sunt translatæ, nulli penitus, nisi soli episcopi regnant, periit honor noster et translatus est ad episcopos civitatum.* Gregor. Turon. l. VI. c. 46.

‡ To protect the churches and defend them against wrongs, bailiffs, so called, were appointed (Advocati, Vice Domini) from the order of laymen (analogous to the defensores of the ancient church), because they were obliged to undertake many sorts of business with which ecclesiastics could not properly meddle.

as an hereditary possession of the church\*—as we find it in fact defined by law, from the time of Charlemagne.

The church had little reason to expect that she would be enabled to obtain for her property any exemption from the law which required all property of Franks to send its contribution to the common fund for the support of the army (Heerbann). True, the bishops and abbots were declared free from the obligation of rendering personal service in war; but as we have already remarked, in the history of Boniface, many Frankish bishops and clergymen still thought proper, in despite of their spiritual calling, to engage personally in warlike expeditions, and all the labours of Boniface to suppress this abuse of barbarism had failed as yet of having the desired effect. But the sight of a large number of clergy wounded and killed in battle having produced a very bad effect on the multitude,† the emperor Charles was solicited to take measures for the prevention of this evil for the future. He commanded, in a capitulary of the year 801,‡ that in future no priest should take part in a battle; but only two or three chosen bishops, with a few priests, should attend the army, for the purpose of preaching, bestowing their blessing, holding mass, hearing confessions, attending upon the sick, imparting the extreme unction, and especially of seeing that none should leave the world without the communion. What hope could there be of victory, where the priests at one hour presented Christians the body of the Lord, and in the next, with their own wicked hands, killed the Christians to whom they had presented it, or the pagans to whom they should have preached Christ; especially as Christ called them the salt of the earth. But at the same time, however, the emperor commanded that the bishops who remained at home with their churches, should send their people well equipped to the army-bann. And so strong was the public opinion that exclusion from all participation in war was discreditable, that the emperor was obliged to affix to this ordinance forbidding the clergy to do personal military service, an express defence and justification of their honour.§

\* *Of the mansus ecclesia.*

† In the petition addressed to the emperor for this purpose, it is said: *Novit Dominus, quando eos in talibus videmus, terror apprehendit nos, et quidam ex nostris timore perterriti, propter hoc fugere solent.*

‡ *Mansi Concil. T. XIII. f. 1054.*

§ *Quia audivimus, quosdam nos suspectos habere, quod honores sacer-*

As already in the Roman empire, Christianity and the church representing it had exerted a special influence on the administration of justice, by introducing and diffusing new views respecting the sacredness of human life,\* respecting human law as emanating from the divine law, respecting the administration of justice, for which account must be rendered to God; and respecting a charity that ennobles justice, a mercy and compassion tempering the severity of law, so the same effect would be still more strongly manifested among these nations, contrasted with the existing barbarism, which was so destitute of all regular legal forms. This effect of Christianity, it may be allowed, was not the same as if it had proceeded out of the pure essence of the gospel; but it was modified by the form in which the gospel was presented among these nations, a form in which the respective points of

dotum et res ecclesiarum auferre vel minorare eis voluisseus. Alcuin also complains that bishops were obliged to leave the duties of their spiritual calling to engage in the foreign employments of war. Thus to bishop Leutfrid (ep. 208), who must have expressed his own views on the subject, he writes to declare how very much opposed he was to this practice: *Vere fateor, quod tua tribulatio torquet animum meum, dum audio te in periculo esse statutum, nec officii tui implere posse ministerium, sed bellator spiritualis bellator cogitur esse carnalis.* Which letter, if the law of the emperor was immediately carried into execution, must have been written before its enactment.

\* Christianity exerted a mighty influence on public opinion, also, through the decided expressions of the church on the subject of suicide, a crime not likely to be unfrequent among barbarous tribes. The second council of Orleans, in 533, decreed in its fifteenth canon, that oblations might be received when offered in behalf of those who *had been executed* for a crime, but not in behalf of those who (perhaps to escape execution) had taken their own lives. The synod at Auxerre (synodus Antisiodorensis), in 578, decreed, c. 17, that no oblation should be received from a person who had drowned or strangled himself, or taken his own life by throwing himself from a tree, or by the sword, or in any other way. In the capitulis of Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury, it is laid down (c. 63) that mass was not to be performed for suicides, but only prayers offered and alms distributed. It was only when the act seemed to have proceeded from a sudden excess of passion or mental derangement, that some were disposed to make an exception.—As many persons, in moments of desperation, when condemned to church penance, had attempted to destroy themselves, the sixteenth council of Toledo (A.D. 693, c. 4), who defined this as *animam suam per desperationem diabolo sociare conari*, decreed, that whoever was rescued from such an attempt should be excluded for the space of two months from the fellowship of the church.

view of the Old and New Testaments were constantly confounded. On the one hand, among nations where hitherto the majority of punishments consisted of pecuniary fines, and where, by the payment of a sum of money, every crime, even murder, could be expiated, the idea was first awakened by Christianity of a punitive justice and regular forms of law; and hence by Christianity still greater severity might be introduced than had existed before. To the rude people, whose feelings had not yet become pervaded and softened by Christianity, this increased severity might wear a colouring of cruel harshness, of revengeful retaliation; but, on the other hand, there proceeded from the church ideas of grace and of compassion which strove to temper the exercise of rigid justice. Whilst on the one hand, Christianity taught men to behold in human life an inviolable sacredness, and hence the murderer must appear but the more worthy of punishment; so, on the other hand, it taught them also to recognize in the transgressor the image of God obscured, the fallen man, who could still be an object of God's redeeming love, to whom therefore a space should be granted for repentance and reformation. For this reason an Alcuin declared himself opposed to the punishment of death.\* It is often mentioned with praise, as the work of pious monks and clergy, that they interceded with the judges to obtain a milder punishment for the guilty,—especially that they sought to procure pardon for criminals condemned to death; and in case they failed, still attempted to reanimate their bodies when taken down from the gallows. If such pious men sometimes failed of discerning the true limits of gentleness; and if, where the administration of justice yielded

\* See Alcuin, ep. 176. This letter can hardly be understood otherwise than as relating to the supposed assassination of pope Leo III., and to the election of a successor (the reading, in this place, should doubtless be *caput ecclesiarum orbis*). But as Leo was not murdered, but only shamefully mishandled, and Alcuin (see ep. 92) declared himself opposed to his deposition, it is most natural to suppose that Alcuin wrote this letter on receiving the first exaggerated report of the pope's assassination. Now with regard to the murderers of the pope, Alcuin, after having demanded their punishment, proceeds to say: *Non ego tamen mortem alicujus suadeo; dicente Deo, Ezech. 33: "Nolo mortem peccatoris, sed ut convertatur et vivat," sed ut sapienti consilio vindicta fiat per alia poenarum genera vel perpetuum (perhaps to be supplied carcerem vel exilii damnatione (m)).*

to their influence, civil order was liable to suffer injury;\* yet of far greater importance was the antagonism thus created against the rude popular feeling, and the influence which thus went to soften the dispositions of men, and make them look upon upon human life as a sacred thing; while in some cases, perhaps, a convent might be converted into a house of reformation for such pardoned criminals.

The right already conferred on churches under the Roman empire, of forming an inviolable sanctuary for the unfortunate and the persecuted, would the more easily pass over to the new churches, because it undoubtedly found a point of attachment in an ancient custom, handed down from the pagan times. Especially important and salutary must such a privilege have become in these days of rude arbitrary will and barbarian cruelty. Thus persecuted individuals could for the moment evade the ferocity of their persecutors, and slaves the anger of their masters; and, in the meantime, ecclesiastics step in as their mediators. It sometimes happened, no doubt, that men in power, while under the influence of their passions, paid no regard to these sacred asylums; but if they were afterwards overtaken by misfortune, as they might sometimes be, as a natural consequence of the insolence which had emboldened them to invade the sanctuary, the common mind seldom failed to interpret this as a terrible example of warning for others.†

\* There lived in the sixth century, near the town of Angouleme, a retired monk, by name Eparchius, to whom large sums of gold and silver were given by devout persons, all which he employed in maintaining the poor and in redeeming captives. The judges were unable to resist the influence of his kindly nature, and often allowed themselves to be persuaded to spare the guilty. Once, however, when a robber, who was accused also of several murders, was about to be executed, the judge, though inclined to spare the man's life, in compliance with the intercession of this monk, found himself compelled to yield to the indignation of the populace, who cried out, that if this person were suffered to live, not a man would be safe in the whole country. Gregor. Turon. l. VI. c. 8.

† Thus, *e. g.*, a duke had fled for refuge, from the persecutions of the Frankish prince Chramnus, to the church of St. Martin of Tours. This Chramnus then caused him to be so narrowly beset on all sides as to render it impossible for him to get even a draught of water, meaning to force him by hunger and thirst to leave the church. When the man was nearly dead, some one contrived to bring him a vessel of water. But the local judge of the district hastened to the spot, forced the vessel from his hands, and poured its contents on the ground. A great sensa-

The emperor Charles, in order to prevent these places of refuge for the persecuted from becoming a means of impunity for all transgressors, commanded, by an ordinance of the year 779, that to murderers, and others liable to capital punishment, no means of subsistence should be allowed in the asylum.\* On the other hand, in the laws of the English king Ina, it was laid down, that whenever such persons took refuge in a church, their lives should be spared, and they should only be subjected to a legal pecuniary fine (composition).† It was considered as a duty of the church to take under its protection the afflicted and oppressed, and to mitigate the sufferings of prisoners. Thus the fifth council of Orleans, in 549, decreed in its twentieth canon, that on every Sunday the prisons should be visited by the archdeacon or presiding officer of the church, in order that the wants of the prisoners might be mercifully provided for, according to the divine laws; and the bishop was to take care that a sufficient supply of food was furnished them by the church. In Spain particularly—where, however, the sense of weakness in the state inclined men to lean more habitually on the protecting arm of the church,—every effort was made to increase this department of her influence. The fourth council of Toledo, in 633, decreed in its thirty-second canon, that the bishops should not neglect the sacred charge, intrusted to them by God, of protecting and defending the people. Whenever, therefore, they saw that the judges and magistrates were oppressors of the poor, they should first endeavour to set them right by priestly admonitions; and, if they would not amend, by complaining of them to the king. And it had already been ordained before, by a royal law,‡ that the judges and tax-gatherers

tion was produced on the public mind by the circumstance, that on the same day this judge was attacked by a fever, and died on the following night. The consequence was, that food in abundance was brought to the unfortunate man from all quarters, and so he was saved. Chramnus himself perished miserably at a later period. Gregor. Turon. I. IV. c. 19. comp. I. V. c. 4.

\* See Baluz. Capitular. I. 197.

† See Wilkins Concil. Angl. f. 59. Alcuin also thought it wrong for a person accused, a fugitivus ad Christi Dei nostri et Sanctorum ejus patrocinia de ecclesia ad eadem reddi vincula. See ep. 195 to Charles the Great.

‡ See Concil. Tolet. III. of the year 589, c. 18.

should be present at the assemblies of the bishops, that they might learn from them how to treat the people with piety and justice. The bishops should also keep an eye on the conduct of the judges.\* We learn from the picture of a devoted bishop, delineated by Gregory of Tours, what was then reckoned as belonging to such a calling. He obtains justice for the people and succour for the needy, imparts consolation to widows, and is the chief protection of minors.† Thus, owing to the peculiar point of view in which, by virtue of their spiritual character, they were regarded on the part of the people and the princes, and owing to what they gradually became as a secular order, the bishops could exercise a very great and salutary formative influence on every department of civil society; but this could only be done when they understood their calling in a truly spiritual sense, and were enabled, in this sense, to direct and manage the heterogeneous mass of business which had become connected with their office. Yet great also was the temptation to which they were exposed, when drawn into the management of affairs so foreign from their holy calling, of overlooking spiritual things in the crowd of secular; nor, by so doing, could they avoid making themselves dependent on the secular power, which they ought rather to have guided by the spirit of Christianity.‡

\* *Sunt enim prospectores episcopi secundum regiam admonitionem qualiter judices cum populis agant.*

† Greg. Turonens. l. IV. c. 35. We make no mention of a law of the emperor Charlemagne, extending the older judicatory power of the bishops beyond its limits; and when but one party applied to their tribunal, obliging the other to follow, willing or not willing, because more recent investigations have thrown doubt on the genuineness of this law, which indeed does not well accord with the character of the government of Charlemagne.

‡ Alcuin complains of this, ep. 112. *Pastores curu& turbant seculares, qui Deo vacare debuerunt, vagari per terras et milites Christi seculo militare coguntur et gladium verbi Dei inter oris claustra qualibet cogente necessitate recondunt.* The same writer complains of the priests, who aspired only after worldly honours, and neglected the duties of their spiritual office, ep. 37: *Quidam sacerdotes Christi, qui habent parochias, et honores seculi et gradus ministerii non (perhaps it should read una) volunt habere.* In epistle 114, he writes to Arno, archbishop of Salzburg, who had complained that he was compelled to neglect the more important duty of the care of souls, to attend to secular business: *Si apostolico exemplo vivamus et pauperem agamus vitam in terris, sicut illi fecerunt, seculi servitium justi abdicamus.* Nunc vero seculi prin-

## II. THE INTERNAL ORGANIZATION OF THE CHURCH.

As it regards the internal constitution of the churches, many changes would unavoidably take place here also, owing to the manner in which Christianity had been first introduced among the people, and to the new social relations. A natural consequence of the former was, the increasing respect entertained for the monks,\* as compared with the clergy. For the most part, the former were, in truth, the founders of the new churches, from which proceeded the civilization of the people and the improvement of the soil ; and by the severity of their morals, and an activity of zeal which conquered every difficulty, they but distinguished themselves the more from the barbarized clergy ; till the wealth, which the monasteries had acquired by the toilsome labours of the monks, brought in its train a deterioration of the primitive monastic virtue. Now, as the degenerated condition of the clergy in the Frankish empire inspired a wish for their reformation, so the consideration and respect in which the monastic order was held naturally led men to propose the latter as a model for imitation ; and in fact many similar attempts had been made, ever since the canonical institute of Augustip, to incorporate the clergy into a body resembling the monastic societies. The most complete experiment of this sort was made after the middle of the eighth century, by Chrodegang of Metz, the founder of the so-called canonical order of the clergy. His plan for the union of the clergy into societies was modelled, for the most part, after the pattern of the Benedictine rule. The clergy scarcely differed from the monks otherwise than

\*cipes habent justam, ut videtur, causam, ecclesiam Christi servitio suo opprimere.

From the monks, the practice of tonsure passed over to the clergy. In the fourth century it became customary for the monks, at their entrance upon the monastic life, to get their hair shorn, as a token of renunciation of the world ; perhaps with some allusion to the vow of the Nazarite. In fact, the monks were usually regarded in the Greek church as Christian Nazarites. In like manner, it was employed in the fifth century to denote consecration to the clerical office, for the clergy too must separate themselves from the world. In the case of the clergy, the distinguishing mark of the tonsure was next, that it should be in formam coronæ. See Concil. Tolet. IV. 633, c. 41, omnes clerici vel lectores sicut levitatem et sacerdotes detinso superius toto capite inferius solam circulum coronam relinquant.

by possessing a certain property of their own. They lived together in the same house, and ate at the same table ; to each was assigned his portion of food and drink, according to a fixed rule ; at appointed hours (the *horæ canonicae*), they came together for prayer and singing ; at an appointed time, assemblies were held of all the members, in which portions of the holy Scriptures, together with the rule,\* were publicly read ; and then, with reference to what had been read, reproofs administered to those who had been delinquent. This rule met with general acceptance ; and was, with some alterations, made legal by the council of Aix, in 816, for the Frankish empire. This change in the life of the clergy was attended, in the outset, with a beneficial influence ; in that it served to counteract, on the one hand, the barbarism of the clerical order, and, on the other, their too servile dependence on the bishops, which had grown in part out of the increased authority of the bishops, who, under the new relations, were important even in their political character ; and in part out of the practice of taking bondmen into the spiritual order.† Thus, too, a more collegiate mode of living together in common was introduced between the bishop and his clergy.

The wide territory over which the new dioceses often extended, and the many remnants of pagan barbarism and of pagan superstition which still lingered behind in them, rendered a careful supervision of them, on the part of the bishops, of the utmost importance. For this reason, what had been before a customary practice, and what conscientious bishops had been used to consider as their special duty, was now settled as an ecclesiastical law. Thus the second council of Braga, in Spain,‡ in 572, decreed in their first canon, that the bishops should visit every place in their diocese, and first inform themselves as to the condition of the clergy ; whether they were well instructed in everything pertaining to the church ritual ; and if they found them not so, they should instruct them. The next day they should call together the laity, and exhort them against the errors of idolatry, and the prevailing vices to which they were formerly addicted.§ And

\* *Capitula* ; hence the name *Dom-chapter*—chapter of the cathedral.

† So that they might be allowed to inflict bodily punishment on their clergy. ‡ *Concilium Bracarense II.*

§ *Doceant illos, ut errores fugiant idolorum vel diversa crimina, id*

the synod at Cloveshove decreed, in the year 747, canon third, that the bishops should annually hold a visitation in their communities, call together the men and women of all ranks and degrees in each place, preach to them the word of God, and forbid them the pagan customs.

With these visitations of the bishops was connected, in the Frankish churches, a regulation which was designed to facilitate the execution of this moral oversight, namely, the regulation\* of the so-called *Send*s.† The bishops were, once a year, to hold a spiritual court in each place of their diocese. Every member of the community should be bound to give information of every wrong action known to him, that had been done by another. To seven of the most approved persons in each community, under the name of Deans (Decani), was committed the oversight over the rest. The archdeacons were to go several days beforehand, and announce the approaching visit of the bishop, so that all the preparations might be made for the court which was to be holden. The bishop, on his arrival, should first place the deans under oath that they would not be moved, by any consideration whatever, to conceal any action which, to their knowledge, had been done contrary to the divine law. Next, he should proceed to question them in details: for example, concerning the observance of pagan customs; whether every father taught his son the creed and the Lord's Prayer; concerning the commission of such crimes, in particular, as were formerly prevalent among these people, and, owing to the reigning spirit of immorality, were not usually recognized as such. The punishments fixed by law, in part corporeal, were inflicted at once; and to carry this out, the civil authorities were bound, in case of necessity, to sustain the bishops with the force at

est homicidium, adulterium, perjurium, falsum testimonium, et reliqua peccata mortifera, aut quod nolunt sibi fieri non faciant alteri et ut credant resurrectionem omnium hominum et diem judicii, in quo uanquisque secundum sua opera recepturus est.

\* The emperor Charles commanded, in a capitulary of the year 801, ut episcopi circumueant parochias sibi commissas et ibi inquirendi studium habeant de incestu, de parricidiis, fraticidiis, adulteriis, cenodoxiis et aliis malis, quae contraria sunt Deo.

† Probably a corruption of the word synod, Diocesan-synod, — called at a later period, in allusion to the court here held by the bishops, *placita episcoporum*.

their command.\* These *Sends* might, no doubt, be attended with many advantages to the people, in that rude condition; but they were also attended with injurious effects. The tribunal of the church, which, according to its original destination, should be spiritual, and inflict only spiritual punishments, assumed the form of a civil court; and the church assumed a coercive power foreign to its peculiar province and calling; all which, in fact, led afterwards to various forms of oppression, and tyranny over the conscience.

To preserve the ancient union among the dioceses, a powerful counteraction was needed against the manifold abuses creeping in under the new relations—abuses which threatened the utter dissolution of that union. In the ancient church there existed in fact a law, that no clergyman should be ordained at large, or otherwise than for a particular church.† The missions first made it a *matter of necessity* to depart from this principle, since it was impossible at once to appoint the monks and ecclesiastics who went out as missionaries, to any particular dioceses. But that which was necessarily occasioned at first by particular circumstances, continued along afterward, when these circumstances had ceased to exist, and became a disorderly practice, which was the source of other disorders. Unworthy individuals contrived, sometimes by simony, to get themselves ordained; and then travelled about the country, making traffic of their spiritual functions. To counteract this abuse, the ancient laws against indeterminate ordinations (ordinaciones absolutæ)‡ were revived; but still with little effect.\* To this was added another abuse. According to the ancient principles of the church, monarchs, as well as all others, should publicly worship God in the church where the whole community assembled; but the spirit of the Byzantine court first introduced an innovation which was opposed to the spirit of the ancient church, in allowing the emperor and the empress to have within their palace a chapel of their own, and along with it an established court clergy.§ Now whether it was the case, that the Frankish

\* Regino of Prüm has more exactly described, in his work *De Disciplina*, how these *Sends* were held.

† The law forbidding the ordinare absolute, *χρηστεῖν ἀπολύτως*.

‡ See the capitularies of the emperor Charles, A.D. 789 and A.D. 794.

§ This custom is said to have been introduced already by Constantine

Sovereigns simply followed this example, or were led to adopt the same course by the necessities of their roving camp-court, they selected their own clergy to go with them and administer the divine service, at whose head stood an arch-chaplain (archicapellanus, primicerius palatii); and these, on account of their continual and intimate connection with the princes, obtained great influence in ecclesiastical affairs. The example of the sovereign was now followed by the nobles and knights, who built private chapels in their castles, and established in them priests of their own,—an arrangement which began to be attended with many mischievous effects. These clergy, relying on the protection of the nobles, threatened to make themselves independent of the diocesan oversight of the bishops.\* Another consequence of this arrangement was, that the public worship of the parish ceased to command the same respect and observance, and might even come to that pass, as to be attended by the poor country people alone—the rich and the poor, each had their worship by themselves. Moreover, these knights often chose unworthy persons, such as the above described itinerant ecclesiastics, who could be hired at a bargain to perform the liturgical acts, and who could easily be used as tools for any work, or else their own bond-men, whom they employed at the same time in the lowest menial services, thus degrading the spiritual office and

the Great. Eusebius (*de vita Constantini*, I. IV. c. 17), strictly understood, says only that he converted his palace into a church, being accustomed to hold in it meetings for prayer and the reading of the bible. But Sozomen (*I.* 8) says, that he had caused a chapel (*εὐκτήσιος οἶκος*) to be fitted up in his palace; while in time of war he used to take along with him a tent prepared expressly for the purposes of worship, for the performance of which a special class of ecclesiastics were appointed. It is clear also, that other persons of rank already followed the example of the emperor, and founded chapels in their houses; hence the decree of the second Trullan council, that no clergyman should perform the rite of baptism, or celebrate the sacrament of the Lord's supper in such a chapel, without the bishop's permission. C. 31. τοὺς ἐν εὐκτήσιοις οἴκοις ἔδοις οἱνας τυγχανοὶ λατουργοῦντας ἢ βαπτίζοντας κληρικοὺς ὑπὲ γνώμης τοῦτο προτείνοντες κατὰ τόπον ιτισκόντου.

\* The council of Chalons sur Saone, concilium Cabilonense, of the year 650, c. 14, cites the complaint of the bishops, quod oratoria per villas potentum jani longo constructa tempore et facultates ibidem collatas ipsi, quorum villae sunt, episcopis contradicunt et jam nec ipso clericos, qui ad ipsa oratoria deserviunt, ab archidiacono coerceri permittant.

religion itself. To counteract these evils, many laws were enacted, having it for their object to preserve the parish worship in due respect.\* Again, the diocesan power of the bishops was liable to be injured by the influence which was conceded to the laity as founders of churches for themselves and their posterity. The emperor Justinian, by laws of the year 541 and 555, laid the first foundation for these so-called rights of patronage. He granted to those who founded churches with specific endowments for the salaries of the clergy, a right for their posterity to propose worthy candidates to the bishops for these spiritual offices; so, however, that the determination of the choice should depend on the bishop's examination.† As under the new relations many churches were founded by individual landholders on their estates, and endowed by them out of their own resources, so this relation had to be more clearly defined. On the one hand, it was considered just to give the founders of such churches a guarantee that the church property, which they had sequestered for this holy purpose, should not be dissipated by the negligence or greediness of bishops; a right of oversight was therefore conceded to them in this respect, and they were also allowed the privilege of proposing to the bishop suitable men to be placed over such churches founded by themselves, as we find it determined by the ninth council of Toledo, in 655.‡ Moreover, their descendants were entitled to the same right of oversight; and in case they found from the bishops and metropolitans no hearing of their complaints concerning the abuse of the property bequeathed to the church by their ancestors, they were allowed the right of appealing to the king. But on the other hand, it must at a very early period have been remarked as an abuse, that these patrons

\* The council of Clermont, A.D. 525, c. 15, and in the capitulary of the year 789, c. 9, decreed, *ut in diebus festis vel dominicis omnes ad ecclesiam veniant et non invitent presbyteros ad domos suas ad missas faciendas.*

† The novels of Justinian, *Ei τις εὐκτήριος οἶκον κατασκευάσῃ, καὶ βουληθείη ἐν αὐτῷ κληρικοῦς προσβάλλεσθαι, ἢ αὐτοὶ ἢ οἱ τούτου κληρονόμοι, εἰ τὰς διατάνατας αὐτοὶ τοῖς κληρικοῖς χορηγήσουσι, καὶ αὖτις ὀνομάσουσι, τοὺς διορισθεῖτας χιροτονεῖσθαι.*

‡ C. 2, *ut quamdiu ecclesiarum fundatores in hac vita superstites extiterint, pro eisdem locis curam permittantur habere sollicitam atque rectores idoneos iisdem ipsis offerant episcopis ordinandos.*

made an arbitrary use of the church property, as if it were their own; that they were as ready to practise simony in disposing of these parish offices as the sovereigns in disposing of the bishoprics, and that they considered the clergy as their retainers, and strove to make them independent of the diocesan power of the bishops. Hence, from the middle of the sixth century to the beginning of the ninth, many laws were devised by the synods against these abuses.\* The sixth council of Arles, in 813, complained,† that unsuitable men were often recommended to the priestly vocation by the laity, commonly for the purpose of gain. It was forbidden them for the future to exact presents for their recommendations.‡

Amidst so many influences, which threatened to dissolve the bond of the diocesan constitution, the bishops would naturally look about them for some means of securing themselves, and of facilitating the supervision of their extensive dioceses. They began dividing them up into several districts (capitula ruralia); placing over each an archpresbyter, to superintend the other parish clergy and priests. But the case was, that the deacons and particularly the archdeacons, by reason of the close connection in which they stood with the bishops, and of their being frequently employed by the latter to transact special business as their delegates and plenipotentiaries, had by degrees obtained an authority transcending the original intention of their office.§ Hence it happened that

\* The fourth council of Orleans, 541, c. 7, *ut in oratoriis domini praediorum minime contra votum episcopi peregrinos, clericos intromittant*, c. 26. *Si qua parochiae in potentum domibus constituta sunt, ubi observantes clerici ab archidiacono civitatis admoniti, fortasse quod ecclesiae debent, sub specie domini domus implere neglexerint, corriganter secundum ecclesiasticam disciplinam.* Comp. the third council of Toledo, 589, c.n. 19. So Boniface ordered: "ut laici presbyteros non ejiciant de ecclesiis nec mittere presumant sine consensu episcoporum suorum, ut omnino non audeant munera exigere a presbyterio propter commendationem ecclesiae cuique presbytero." Bonifac. epistolæ ed. Würdtwein, f. 140.

† C. 5.

‡ *Ut laici omnino a presbyterio non audeant munera exigere propter commendationem ecclesiae.*

§ Against this Concil. Toletan. IV. A.D. 633, c. 39, nonnulli diacones in tantam erumpunt superbiain, ut se presbyteris anteponant, and the council of Merida in Spain, concilium Emeritense, A.D. 666, c. 5, that the bishop should send an archpresbyter, not a deacon, as his plenipotentiary to a council.

the bishops of the eighth and ninth centuries would appoint archdeacons as their plenipotentiaries for the superintendence of the several great divisions of their dioceses ; and to these, as such, even the parish clergy who were priests became subordinate.\* Hence arose the great power of the archdeacons, designed at first to counteract abuses in the administration of the dioceses ; but which, being abused, began already to introduce the same oppressions, and thus to become mischievous itself.†

As it respects the general forms of ecclesiastical union, the metropolitan constitution passed over, it is true, to the new churches, and many laws were enacted by the synods for the purpose of establishing it ; but as this stood originally in the closest connection with the political constitution of the Roman empire, it therefore could not, under circumstances so different, where there were no cities exactly corresponding to the Roman metropolitan towns, be made by the dead letter of these laws so vital an institution, as it had been in the ancient church. The paramount authority, and the paramount influence of a bishop, depended far more, under the new relations, on the capacity and position of the individual than on the political standing of the city embraced in his bishopric. The Frankish bishops, therefore, had no interest in subjecting themselves to a dependence of this sort ; and the Frankish love of freedom was averse to it. This disinclination of the bishops to the recognition of any such form of dependence in their neighbourhood, contributed to make them more ready to acknowledge the dependence, less burdensome to themselves, on a more distant head of the whole church, as in this they might find a means of protection against the detested power of the metropolitans ; and accordingly this had an important influence on

\* Thus the archdeacon appears as a plenipotentiary of the bishop in the council of Chalons, A.D. 650, c. 7. The power of the archdiaconate, and the revenues of the office, caused it already to be sought after by laymen ; hence the decree of the emperor Charles, A.D. 805, c. 2. *Ne archidiaconi sint laici.* But the same thing was decreed also with regard to the appointment of archpresbyters by a council of Rheims, 630, c. 19, *ut in parochiis nullus laicorum archipresbyter præponatur.*

† A proof of this is the ordinance of a synod held by Boniface in the year 745 : *prevideant episcopi, ne cupiditas archidiaconorum suorum culpas nutriat, quia multis modis mentitur iniquitas sibi.* Bonifac. *Ep. f. 161.*

## GREGORY THE GREAT.

the shaping of that form of ecclesiastical constitution which became a thing of so great moment to the entire system of the church, namely, the *papacy*.

In the gradual unfolding of the theocratical system, everything depended on the complete form of the papacy; for so long as the bishops stood singly opposed to the sovereigns at the same time that they were dependent on them, the church as a whole could not easily come off triumphant out of the contest with the secular power. But everything would have to assume a different shape when a man, independent of the sovereigns by his position, stood at the head of the entire church,—a man who pursued a consistent plan, and knew how to avail himself of every circumstance for its execution. Now we saw, in the preceding period, how the ideal of such a *papacy* had in fact already been formed in the minds of the Roman bishops, and how they had already taken advantage of various circumstances for the support of their claims. In an age which had been rent from all historical connection with the earlier centuries, many things of this sort, however, might, when contemplated from a distance, seem invested with greater importance than, in themselves considered, they really possessed.

We commence this period with a man who, penetrated with the conviction that to him, as the successor of St. Peter, was divinely committed the oversight of the entire church, and its supreme guidance, showed by the vigilant eye which he directed to every part of the church, far and near, and by his no less constant activity, what a single individual, in the midst of disorders breaking in on all sides, could effect when placed at the head of the whole. This man was Gregory the First, called the Great. Taken from his retreat in a monastery\* consecrated to silent meditation, Gregory was suddenly thrown into an active situation, where he found himself surrounded by business of the most complicated and heterogeneous character. When he would have gladly devoted himself with all his energies to the duties of a spiritual shepherd, he found himself compelled, by a regard for the good

\* Gregory says of himself: *Quasi prospero flatu navigabam, cum tranquillam vitam in monasterio ducerem, sed procellosis subito motibus tempestas exorta in sua perturbatione me rapuit*, l. IX. ep. 121.

of his communities, for his duties to his church and to the Greek empire, whose vassal he was, to undertake the management of a multitude of affairs, toilsome in themselves, and altogether foreign from his spiritual office. While beholding with his own eyes the desolation, spread far and wide by wasting pestilences, and by the sword of merciless barbarians,\* while prostrated himself, for months, by bodily sufferings on the bed of sickness, he must still bear the heavy and manifold burdens of his office.† He had to watch for the security of the imperial provinces in Italy, which were continually encroached upon by the Longobards, and to conduct the negotiations with this people; and when, to preserve the quiet and peace of his own communities, he yielded anything to *them*, he exposed himself to be accused by the emperors, of having given up too much which was rightly theirs. He spared no pains to alleviate the distress of the inhabitants of Italy, impoverished by the wars, and to relieve the sufferers who, from all the wasted districts, took refuge with him. He kept a vigilant eye on the bishops of his own particular patriarchal diocese, and dealt severely with the negligent, who hoped to take advantage of the general disorder to escape with impunity. He had to maintain a strict watch over the administration of the property belonging to the Roman church in Africa, in Gaul, in Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica, and in several provinces of the East. To these latter he sent for the purpose *defensores* chosen from among his own clergy; and by their means he was moreover enabled to contract eccl-

\* He himself gives the following description of the state of his times: *Destructæ urbes, eversa sunt castra, depopulati agri, in solitudinem terra redacta est, nullus in agris incola, paene nullus in urbibus habitator remansit et tanien ipsæ parvæ generis humani reliquæ adhuc quotidie et sine cessatione feriuntur. Alios in captivitatem duci, alias detruncari, alias interfici videmus. Ipsa autem, quæ aliquando mundi domina esse videbatur, qualis remanserit, conspicimus. Immensis doloribus multipliciter attrita, desolatione civium, impressione hostium, frequentia ruinarum. In Ezekiel, I. II. H. VI. § 21.* The devastation caused by pestilence seemed nothing compared to that by the sword. He thus drew comfort from death by the pestilence: *Quantas detruncationes, quantas crudelitates vidimus, quibus mors sola remedium et erat vita tormentum.* ep. I. X. ep. 63.

† He himself says: *Quam grave sit confusis temporibus locis majoribus esse præpositum, ex nostro prorsus dolore sentimus.* epp. I. X. ep. 37.

## GREGORY'S DEPORTMENT TOWARDS PRINCES

eiastical and political alliances\* in all those countries, to inform himself of their ecclesiastical condition, and to bring his influence to bear upon it.

Gregory was governed by the conviction that on him, as the successor of St. Peter, devolved the care of the whole church, and its sovereign guidance; which, therefore, he believed himself authorized to extend over the Greek church.† He held it to be his duty to preserve inviolate this authority of the Roman church, which seemed to him to have been conferred on her for the welfare of the church universal; but he himself repelled all those marks of honour which subserved no higher end, and by which the bishops might be turned aside from fulfilling the duties of their pastoral office. It being a prevailing custom in Sicily for the bishops to observe a festival on the anniversary of the ordination of the Roman bishop, Gregory put a stop to it, as a foolish, vain, and superfluous mark of respect.‡ If they must come together, he said, they ought much rather to choose for this purpose the festival of St. Peter, that they might thank him from whom they had received the pastoral office.§ A

\* Gregory could not, indeed, judge with impartiality respecting the conduct of monarchs who ruled over the East-Roman and Frankish empires, especially when viewed at a distance, but was blinded by a regard for the interests of the church. He was moreover so far misled as to speak in his letters, for example, to the emperor Phocas, and to ~~Emen~~hild, rather in the language of the court and of the politician than in that of simple Christian truthfulness. Thus it brought great reproach upon him, that he should be so far led astray, as to approve, in a congratulatory letter to the emperor Phocas (l. XIII. ep. 31) his accession to the throne, which, though it was brought about by crime, he called a glorious work of God. Yet he gives the emperor, on this occasion, excellent advice, delivering himself here not like a courtier, but as the Christian bishop: "Reformetur jam singulis sub jugo imperii pii libertas sua. Hoc namque inter reges gentium et reipublicæ imperatores distat, quod reges gentium domini servorum sunt, imperatores vero reipublicæ, domini liberorum." Surely suitable advice to a Byzantine emperor.

† De Constantiopolitana ecclesia quis cam dubitet, apostolice sedi esse subjectam? Quod et piissimus imperator et frater noster ejusdem civitatis episcopus assidue profitentur, l. IX. ep. 12. Which, to be sure, was refuted by the quarrel between Gregory and the patriarch of Constantinople, hereafter to be mentioned. He already lays down the principle in reference to the transactions of the church assembly at Constantinople (l. IX. ep. 68): Sine apostolice sedis auctoritate atque consensu nullas queque acta fuerint vires habeant.

‡ Quia stulta et vana superfluitas non delectat.

§ Ex cuius largitate pastores sint. As the power to bind and to loose,

bishop of Messina having sent him, as an honourable present, a magnificent dress, he caused it to be sold, and sent back the avails to the bishop, telling him\* it was behooving to abolish those customs which tended to oppress the church; that presents never should be sent to a quarter whence they should rather be received;† and he forbade them for the future. When the same bishop proposed to visit Rome, Gregory begged him to spare himself this trouble, and to pray rather that the more distantly they were separated from each other the more cordially they might, by the help of Christ, be united in the fellowship of a mutual charity. We have already said‡ that it was far from his wish to make the Roman church the sole model for all liturgical regulations. Accordingly, on another occasion he avowed the principle that the good, wherever found, even though it might be in churches of an inferior name, should be copied and retained.§ He reproved his agent and plenipotentiary in Sicily|| because he encroached on the rights of others in defending those of the Roman church; no man, he said, could be a faithful servant of St. Peter who did not, even in his own affairs, fearlessly maintain the rights of truth.

The wise manner in which Gregory exercised his authority over negligent bishops, uniting gentleness and forbearance with a due degree of severity, is illustrated by a remarkable example in the case of Natalis, bishop of Salona in Dalmatia,

committed to St. Peter, was the fountain-head of all episcopal power, so all the bishops were instruments of the apostle Peter-- which idea gradually passed over into the other, according to which all episcopal power, and the nomination of all bishops, ought to proceed from the Roman church. See lib. I. ep. 36.

\* L. I. ep. 66. Non delectamur xenii.

† Ne illuc aliqua cogantur inferre, unde sibi inferenda debent potius expectare.

‡ L. IX. ep. 12. Ego et minores meos, quos ab illicitis prohibeo, in bono imitari paratus sum. Stultus est enim, qui in eo se primum existimat, ut bona, quae viderit, discere contemnat.

§ See I. I. ad Petrum Subdiaconum, ep. 36.

|| Tunc vere Petri apostoli miles eris, si in causis ejus veritatis custi-  
diam etiam sine ejus acceptatione tenueris. And gave him these in-  
structions besides, which no doubt were seriously meant: Laici nobiles  
pro humilitate te diligent, non pro superbia perhorrescant. Et tamen  
quum eos fortasse contra quoslibet inopes injustitiam aliquam agere cog-  
noscis, humilitatem protinus in erectionem verte, ut eis semper et bene  
agentibus subditus et male agentibus adversarius existas.

GREGORY'S TREATMENT OF NATALIS OF SALONA.

—a case which shows at the same time how much the bishops of this age stood in need of such oversight. Bishop Natalis of Salona neglected his spiritual vocation as a pastor, spending his time and money in festive entertainments. He made presents to his relations of the vessels and hangings of the churches; and, being annoyed by the honesty of a certain archdeacon Honoratus, who protested against such unlawful proceedings, he removed him from this office, under the pretext that he intended to promote him.\* Gregory commanded the bishop to restore the archdeacon to his office; he pointedly rebuked his unspiritual conduct, and threatened to subject him to a rigid trial.† But the impudent sophistry with which Natalis defended his habits of life redounded to his greater shame. In defence of his banquets he said that Abraham had been honoured by entertaining angels; that such hospitality was a charitable work;‡ that Christ had been called a glutton and wine-bibber, Matt. xi.; that he who eateth not should not judge him that eateth, Rom. xiv. § When admonished to study the Holy Scriptures bishop Natalis had excused himself partly on account of bodily infirmities, which would not allow him to read, and partly on the ground of Christ's promise to grant the illumination of the Spirit, Matt. x. 19. In reference to the first difficulty Gregory replied that, as the Holy Scriptures were given for our comfort, therefore the more we are bowed down by suffering, the more they ought to be read. As to the second, he said it would follow from it that divine

\* Whoever was raised from the office of an archdeacon to the rank of a presbyter, seemed by this elevation to lose more than he gained. See above p. 153.

† See I. II. ep. 18.

‡ Gregory gave the bishop, who seems to have used sarcastic language towards him as a friend of fasting, the suitable reply: Convivia, quae ex intentione impendenda caritatis sunt, recte sanctitas vestra in suis epistolis laudat. Sed tamen sciendum est, quia tunc ex caritate veraciter prodeunt, quum in eis nulla absentium vita mordetur, nullus ex irrisione reprehenditur, et nec inanes in eis secularium negotiorum fabulae; sed verba sacre lectionis audiuntur, quam non plus quam necesse est survitur corpori, sed sola ejus infirmitas reficitur, ut ad usum exercendae virtutis habeatur. Haec itaque si vos in vestris convivis agitis, abstinentium fateor magistri estis.

§ On this point, too, Gregory aptly remarks: Quia neque ego non comedo neque ad hoc a Paulo dictum est, ut membra Christi, quae in ejus corpore, id est in ecclesia invicem sibi caritatis compage connexa sunt, nullam de se ullo modo curam gerant.

revelation had been given us to no purpose—he who is filled by the Spirit needs not the outward word. But that which we might confidently reply upon in times of trouble and persecution was one thing; that which we are bound to do in the peaceful times of the church was quite another.\*

Though Gregory claimed for the Roman church an authority of supreme jurisdiction over all the others—which authority he expressly maintained in its relation to the church of Constantinople—yet he was far from denying, or from wishing to disparage the independent episcopal rank of any other. Eulogius, patriarch of Alexandria, who, as a Greek, was not careful to weigh phrases when dealing in the language of compliment, having, in a letter to him, used the words “as you commanded,” Gregory begged him always to avoid expressions of that sort; “for,” said he, “I know who *I* am and who you are; in dignity and rank you are my brother; in piety my father. I did not *command* you, but only endeavoured to point out to you what seemed to me to be expedient.” Again, he had addressed him as *Papa universalis*, a title which the Greek bishops of the principal cities, accustomed in their fulsome style to take words for less than they meant, were often used to apply to each other; but Gregory, who more nicely weighed the import of words, found it offensive. He was ashamed of a title which seemed to disparage the dignity of his colleagues.† Away, said he, with expressions which nurture vanity, and wound love. On the same principle, Gregory found fault with Johannes the Faster (*νηστευτής*), patriarch of Constantinople, when he assumed to himself the title of ecumenical bishop—which was not uncommon with the bishops of the chief cities in the East. But to Gregory there was a dangerous import in this not badly intended epithet of Oriental vanity. True, he was so blinded by his passionate zeal for what he supposed to be the injured honour of the Roman church, as to make an important matter

\* Aliud est, frater carissime, quod angustati persecutionis tempore absque dubitatione confidere, aliud quod in tranquillitate ecclesiae agere debemus. Oportet enim nos per hunc spiritum modo legendi percipere quae possimus, si contigerit causa in nobis, etiam patiendo demonstrare.

† So that an appeal could also be made from the decision of the patriarch of Constantinople to Rome. Gregor. epp. l. VI. ep. 24.

‡ Nec honorem esse deputo, in quo fratres meos honorem suum perdere cognosco. Meus namque honor est honor universalis ecclesiae. l. VIII. ep. 30.

of a thing which, in this connection, was utterly insignificant ;<sup>\*</sup> and by no explanations of the patriarch, and of others who wished in some way or other to settle the difficulty, would he allow himself to be satisfied ; being determined to look simply at what the word *might signify*, not at what it *ought to signify*, according to the intention of those who used it.† Nor did he strictly conform, in his conduct towards the patriarch John, to the rule of Christian integrity, when he rebuked him on account of his pretensions in mild but earnest language, not because he was prompted so to do by the temper of Christian love, but simply because he wished to spare the feelings of the emperor ; for so he wrote to his plenipotentiary in Constantinople.‡ Yet the Christian spirit of the man expresses itself remarkably in his language, when he so earnestly insists that, as this epithet belongs to our Saviour alone, the common though invisible head over all, it should be applied to no merely human being. “Verily, when Paul heard that some said, I am of Paul ; others, I am of Apollos ; others, I am of Cephas, he exclaimed —with the strongest abhorrence of this rending asunder of the body of Christ, by which his members were, so to speak, attached to other heads—Was Paul crucified for you, or were ye baptized in the name of Paul ? If then, he could not tolerate that the members of the Lord’s body should be arranged in parcels, as it were, and become attached to other heads than Christ, even though these heads were apostles, what wilt thou say who, by assuming the title of ‘universal,’ seekest to subject

\* Thus he could say, as though *one* individual could make the faith of the entire church dependent on *his* person : *In isto scelesto vocabulo consentire, nihil est aliud quam fidem perdere.* 1. V. ep. 19.

† The patriarch Anastasius of Antioch had, not without reason, admonished him that he ought not, by this dispute, to belie his own character, nor to make room in his soul for the evil spirit ; that he ought not, for so trivial a cause, to disturb the unity and peace of the church. But Gregory, who stuck firmly to that which the word *might signify* in itself, was therefore unwilling to admit this ; and said on the other hand : *Si hanc causam aequanimiter portamus, universæ ecclesie fidem corrumpimus. Scitis enim, quanti non solum hæretici, sed etiam hæretarische de Constantinopolitana sunt egressi.* 1. VII. ep. 27.

‡ L. V. ep. 19. It was not his wish to write two letters : he had, therefore, written but one, quæ utrumque videtur habere admixtum, id est et rectitudinem et amaritudinem. Tua itaque delectio eam epistolam, quam nunc direxi, propter voluntatem imperatoris dare studeat. Nam de sub sequenti talis alia transmittetur, de qua ejus superbia non latetur.

all Christ's members to thyself? What wilt thou say to Him, the head of the universal church, at the final judgment? In truth, what is Peter, the first of the apostles, other than a member of the holy and universal church? What are Paul, Andrew, and John, other than heads of single communities? And yet all subsist as members under the one only head.\* Gregory, however,† was not able to carry his point, and later Roman bishops did not scruple to apply this epithet to themselves.

As to the relation of the popes to the Roman emperors in the East, these latter, their ancient masters would, no doubt, be peculiarly indulgent to them, as their wealthiest and most powerful vassals, who had the greatest influence with the people; particularly while the situation of their western provinces, which were threatened more and more by the encroachments of the Longobards, continued to be so dubious. For the same reason they would be inclined to allow them many privileges. Yet the Roman bishops ever acknowledged their dependence on the Roman empire. From their entrance into office until their end they maintained, by plenipotentiaries chosen from among their clergy, a constant connection with the emperors;‡ and at Constantinople the confirmation of their election, made by the Roman clergy, and the notables of the communities, was applied for, before they could be ordained.§ It sometimes happened, as appeared in our history of doctrines, that individual popes were obliged to suffer from the Greek emperors very severe ill-usage, from refusing to accommodate themselves

\* Certe Petrus apostolorum primus membrum sanctæ et universalis ecclesiæ, Paulus, Andreas, Johannes, quid aliud quam singularium sunt plebium capita? et tamen sub uno capite omnes membra. l. V. ep. 18.

† That Gregory was led to assume, in his own letters, the epithet *Servus servorum Dei*, in opposing the arrogance of the patriarch, is not so certain; nor is it necessarily implied in the words of Johannes Diaconus, *vita Gregorii*, l. II. c. 1. *Primus omnium se in principio epistoliarum suarum servum servorum Dei scribi satis humiliter definivit.* For the rest, this epithet well accords with the manner in which he administered his office, l. XI. ep. 44. *Ego per episcopatus onera servus sum omnium factus.* ‡ *Responsales. Apocrisiarii.*

§ In the Diary of the popes of the eighth century,—the *liber diurnus Romanorum pontificum*,—is to be found the form of such an application, addressed to the emperor, wherein it is said: *Lacrimabiliter cuncti famuli supplicamus, ut dominorum pietas servorum suorum obsecraciones dignanter exaudiat et concessa pietatis sue jussione petentium desideria ad effectum de ordinatione ipsius præcipiat pervenire.*

to their will; yet, as the power of the emperors in Italy was drawing to an end, this dependent relation of the popes on the Greek empire also relaxed, and hence so much the more was depending on the question respecting the shape which their new relation would take to the states and churches formed out of the ruins of the Roman empire.

The popes stood in the most unfavourable relation, both in an ecclesiastical and in a political point of view, to the people who had established themselves nearest to them, viz., the Longobards; for these were hostile to the East Roman empire, and devoted to Arianism. This last cause of misunderstanding ceased, it is true, when, in 587, queen Theodolinde came over to the Catholic church; but the former still continued to operate; though occasional examples may be noticed, in the eighth century, of an impression of respect produced even on Longobardian princes, by those who claimed to be successors of the apostle Peter. The Spanish church had, from the earliest times, maintained a close connection with the Roman. This connection may now, indeed, have been interrupted by the Visigothic dominion in Spain, in which Arianism predominated; but the older Spanish communities kept it up, even under the foreign domination, which in fact rendered it of so much the more importance to them. Accordingly, when in the year 589, Reckared, king of the Visigoths, embraced the church doctrine of the Trinity, the whole Spanish church now entered into the same relation to the Roman, as had been maintained before by the minority; and the most eminent individual among the Spanish bishops—Leander, bishop of Seville—solicited and obtained, from pope Gregory the Great, *the pall*, as the token of his primacy. This was the beginning of a long-continued, an active, and living intercourse. The indefatigable Gregory the Great took advantage of this to establish his authority as supreme judge, in the case of two bishops deposed by the arbitrary will of a nobleman. This he carried through to a successful issue. True, the Spanish king Witiza attempted, in the year 701, to restore the independence of the Spanish church; and, on occasion of an appeal by certain Spanish bishops, forbade all such appeals, refusing to allow any legal force to ordinances made by a foreign bishop for the churches belonging to his states. Yet as Spain was soon afterwards severed from all connection with the rest of

Christendom by the conquest of the Arabians, this act lost by that event all its influence on the further development of the church.

The English church, from the very form and manner of its foundation, would, as we have already remarked, be brought into a peculiar relation of dependence on the church of Rome; and the same relation continued to exist, and to be still further developed. English monks and nuns, bishops, nobles, and princes, often made pilgrimages to Rome, for the purpose of visiting the tomb of St. Peter; and these frequent pilgrimages served to knit closer that original connection. Although these pilgrimages in the eighth century often exercised an injurious influence on morals, yet it should not be overlooked that by these travels, and the correspondence which they occasioned with countries where, from ancient times, a higher state of culture existed, something was contributed to the work of transplanting that culture among a yet uncivilized people; while a store of bibles and other books, as well as the elements of many of the arts, were thus conveyed to England.\* The acts of individual princes, who, under the influence of passion, revolted against the papal authority, could effect no important alteration in the hitherto prevailing rule.

The relations of the church of Rome to that of the Franks in Gaul were not of so favourable a nature; the latter having, in fact, sprung up more independently of Rome, in a country where examples were already, at a much earlier period, to be found, of a spirit of ecclesiastical independence, and among a people who, in general, were not inclined to become subject to any foreign yoke, and whose sovereigns could not easily

\* The English abbot Benedictus Biscopius, who lived near the close of the seventh century, Bede says: *Toties mare transiit, nunquam vacuus et inutilis rediit; sed nunc librorum copiam sanctorum, nunc architected ecclesiae fabricandæ, nunc vitrificatores ad fenestras ejus decorandas ac muniendas, nunc picturas sanctarum historiarum, quæ non ad ornatum solummodo ecclesiae, verum etiam ad instructionem proponerentur, ad- vexit, videlicet ut qui literarum lectio non possent, opera Domini et salvatoris nostri per ipsarum contumum discerunt imaginum.* See Bolland. *Acta sanctorum.* Mens. Januar. T. I. f. 746. Of the same person Bede says: *Oceano transmisso Gallias petens cæmentarios, qui lapideam sibi ecclesiam juxta Romanorum, quem semper amabat, morem facerent, postulavit, accepit, attulit.* See Mabillon, *Acta sanct. ord. Benedict.* sec. II. f. 1004.

accustom themselves to the idea of a foreign power interfering in the institutions of their state. Hence, in the times of the new Frankish church, as far down as to the age of Gregory the Great, but few examples are to be found of papal interference.\*

Gregory, who was so active in extending his supervisory care over the whole church, contrived to enter into various alliances with the princes, nobles, and bishops of the Franks. He took a lively interest in the affairs of the Frankish church. He considered it subject to his superintendence, and treated it accordingly. But amid the political disorders of the Frankish kingdom, in the next succeeding times, the connection with Rome became continually more lax. We noticed, indeed, in our account of the missions, how many tendencies, repugnant to the system of the Roman hierarchy, were threatening to make good their entrance into the Frankish kingdom; till Boniface, by his far-reaching activity, laid the foundation for an entirely new relation of the churches to the papacy, under his direction, as papal legate.† The influence of this change

\* An example, however, which shows to what extent the supreme judicial authority of the popes was recognized in the empire of the Franks, is this: Two bishops, Saloniūs of Embrun (Ebredunensis) and Sagittarius of Gap (Vapiungensis), had been deposed, on account of certain violent proceedings, altogether inconsistent with their vocation, in which they had indulged. They afterwards appealed, however, to pope John III., and obtained permission from king Guntram, whose favour they enjoyed, to proceed for this purpose to Rome. The French bishops probably paid no attention to this appeal, and therefore sent no prosecutors to Rome. Yet the pope allowed himself to be determined by the false reports of these appellants alone, and in a letter to the king, demanded that they should be restored again to their places; with which requisition their protector, the king, immediately complied, since it was in accordance with his own inclination; and by the power of the king, who lent himself to the pope because he was much more inclined to serve the humour of the moment than the real interests of the church, they got possession again of the offices of which they had been justly deprived, and continued also to show themselves unworthy of them. Gregor. Turon. hist. l. V. c. 21.

† By means of Boniface it was also made a custom, that the robe of honour (made of white linen [pallium], byssō candente contextum. Joh. Diacon. vita Gregor. IV. 80), conferred at first by the popes on their special representatives among the bishops (the apostolicis vicariis), or on the primates, should be confirmed by the popes on all metropolitans, as a mark of their spiritual rank, by which means also a relation of dependence on the Roman church was established.

was soon manifested in the fact that Pipin could hope, by securing the pope's approval, to sanction his illegal act in seizing the royal dignity ; and this weight of influence attributed to the voice of the pope, could not fail to react again upon the popular opinion entertained of the papacy. Yet at the bottom of all this lay a tacit recognition of the pope's authority to decide, in the last instance, on matters pertaining to civil relations. From king Pipin pope Stephen II. afterwards obtained, in his difficulties with the Longobards, then threatening Rome and the possessions of the Roman church, that assistance which he had sought in vain from the feeble government of the East Roman emperors. When, in the year 755, Pipin re-conquered from the Longobards the territories they had acquired, he declared that he fought in defence of the patrimony of St. Peter, and declined giving back what he had won to the Greek empire. On the contrary, he ordered the deed of gift, whereby the possessions were bestowed on the Roman church, to be placed by his chaplain on the tomb of St. Peter. By degrees the connection between the popes and the East Roman empire grew continually more feeble, and in place of this antiquated relation came in the new one to the empire of the Franks.

This new relation was more firmly established when Charlemagne destroyed the kingdom of the Longobards in Italy, and founded there, in its stead, the dominion of the Franks. He often, in company with the most eminent of his nobles and bishops, visited Rome ; and on all such occasions showed the greatest respect for the memory of St. Peter. On one of these occasions, the Christmas of the year 800, pope Leo III., amid the joyful shouts of the people, placed on his head, in the church of St. Peter, the imperial crown. This act, though it may not have proceeded with any distinct consciousness from the theocratical point of view in which the popes regarded their relation to the new states and churches ; and though it may not have been distinctly looked upon in this light by those present, was easily capable, however, of being referred by the later popes to this point of view, and appealed to, as laying the foundation of a right which had resulted from that relation, and which had been practically acknowledged.

There was much that still remained vague and unsettled in

## POPES DECLARE THEMSELVES HEADS OF THE CHURCH.

this new relation, which had arisen between the popes and the emperor of the West ; much that could not be clearly and satisfactorily decided till a later period. The popes, in their letters to the emperor Charles, avowed it as a principle which admitted of no question, that they, as the successors of St. Peter, were heads of the entire church ; that to them belonged spiritual jurisdiction over all ; and that they themselves could be judged by no man ; that all other spiritual power was derived from them ; and, in particular, that the several dioceses had received from them the determination of their boundaries.\* Already the popes began to bring other matters before their theocratical courts than those purely spiritual. Pope Stephen II. peremptorily forbade king Charles to take a wife from the unclean nation of the Longobards,† whom, by a singular confounding together of things spiritual and temporal, he unchristianly denounces, on account of their hostility to the Roman states, as outcasts from the divine favour. He wrote to the Frankish princes that, in general, they were not to presume to contract any marriage alliance contrary to the will of him who represented the first of the apostles. To do so would be showing contempt, not to himself personally, but to St. Peter, in whose place he stood, and concerning whom Christ has said, he that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that despiseth you despiseth me, Matt. x.‡ Nor should a princess of the Franks be allowed to marry any person descended from the royal family of the Longobards. And the pope threatened, in the most appalling language, the anathema of the church, against any who should disregard this papal ordinance ; as if it rested

\* Pope Hadrian I. says : *Sedes apostolica caput totius mundi et omnium Dei ecclesiarum.* Cod. Carolin. et Cenni T. I. p. 389. *Cujus sollicitudo delegata divinitus cunctis debetur ecclesiis.* — *A qua si quis se abscedit, fit Christianae religionis extorris,* p. 443. *Quae de omnibus ecclesiis fas habet judicandi neque cuiquam licet de ejus judicare judicio, quorum liber sententis ligata pontificum jus habebit solvendi, per quos ad unam Petri sedem universales ecclesiae cura confluit,* p. 519. *Dum unusquisque episcopus per instituta sanctorum canonum atque predecessorum nostrorum pontificum privilegiorum et sanctionum jura receperint.* p. 510.

† To be sure, he required also, at the same time — a matter which more properly belonged to his tribunal — that the emperor should not thrust away his lawful wife ; yet he would have insisted on the same thing, independently of this latter.

‡ See l. c. pag. 285.

wholly with the pope to open or to shut the kingdom of heaven.\*

As this view of the spiritual power belonging to the papacy was intimately connected with the whole theocratic idea, which had its foundation in the peculiar development of the church in that period, hence it was that even the most distinguished men of the age, such, for instance, as Alcuin, were under the influence of the same mode of thinking.† This view of the matter would enter, therefore, no less into the mind of the emperor Charles; but, on the other hand, there are indications that other influences were brought to bear on him, which aimed to produce a rupture between him and the pope, and to work him up to a dispute of the papal authority. There was no lack of those who filled his ears with evil reports about the pope and the Roman church.‡ But such isolated instances of reaction against the dominant spirit of the church, whether proceeding from personal enemies of the popes or from freer dogmatic tendencies in Ireland or Spain, could avail nothing. The emperor, in all ecclesiastical matters, sought to act in a common understanding with the Roman church. In doubtful cases he frequently solicited advice from the popes; yet he by no means allowed himself to be governed

\* *Sciat se auctoritate domini mei St. Petri apostolorum principis mathematicis vinculo esse innodatum et a regno Dei alienum atque cum diabolo et ejus atrocissimis pompis aeternis incendiis concremandum.*  
pag. 288.

† In his ep. 20, to pope Leo III., he calls him *princeps ecclesiae, unius immaculatae columbae nutritor*, and he says, *vere dignum esse fateor, omnem illius gregis multitudinem suo pastori licet in diversis terrarum pascuis commorantem una caritatis fide subiectam esse.*

‡ Thus, for example, bad reports had come to the ears of the emperor respecting the incontinence of the Roman clergy, so that he thought it necessary to represent the matter to pope Hadrian. The latter vindicated himself, and warned him against believing the false charges of those who wished to destroy the friendly relations subsisting between them: *nunc vero quererunt semuli nostri qui semper zizania seminaverunt, aliquam inter partes malitiam seminare*, pag. 371. Thus, the report had been spread (perhaps also a forged letter of the English king to the emperor), that the English king Offa had invited the emperor to depose pope Hadrian, and nominate another pope of Frankish descent. l. c. 506. He felt constrained to warn him of the influence of the heretics, who sought to draw him off from the doctrines and ordinances of the Romish church: *procaces ac haereticos homines, qui tuam subvertere nituntur orthodoxam fidem et undique te coarctantes, angustias et varias tempestates seminant.* pag. 390.

alone and always by their decision, but acted freely, also, according to his own independent convictions; and, in many cases, followed the better wisdom of his enlightened theologians; even though at variance with the then prevailing tendency of the Roman church and with the judgment of the pope; of which we shall see examples under the history of doctrines.

In respect of the landed property of the Roman church, Charles added new territories to those already bestowed by his bequest and to stimulate him to further benefactions, the father; to the Roman church by Constantine the Great were often appealed to—deeds which were either forged for this very purpose, or which had been already forged at an earlier period for similar purposes.\* Yet the pope was by no means sovereign master over this kind of property, but subject to the superior lordship of the emperor, who exercised his control here, as over the lands of his other vassals, by means of messengers (Missi). When, in the year 800, pope Leo III. was roughly treated by conspirators, who plotted to take his life, and who afterwards sought to extenuate their conduct by accusing the pope, the emperor convened at Rome a synod, which he attended in person, for the purpose of investigating the affair; but the bishops† chosen for this purpose declared, it belonged to the pope to judge them, and not to them to judge the pope. The latter could be judged by no man; and so also thought Alcuin.‡

\* Worthy of notice in this respect are the words of pope Hadrian I. A.D. 777, to the emperor Charles: *Et sicut temporibus S. Silvestri a piissimo Constantino M. imperatore per eum largitatem Romana ecclesia elevata atque exaltata est et potestatem in his Hesperiae partibus largiri dignatus est cat. ecce novus Christianissimus Constantinus imperator his temporibus surrexit, per quem omnia Deus sancta sua ecclesiae apostolorum principis Petri largiri dignatus est. Sed et cuncta alia, quae per diversos imperatores, Patricios etiam et alios Deum timentes pro eorum anima mercede et venia delictorum in partibus Turcia, Spoleto, seu Benevento atque Corsica simul et Sabinensi (Sabinensi) patrimonio Petro apostolo concessa sunt cat. vestris temporibus restituantur. He appeals to the donations in scrinio Lateranensi reconditas, which he sent to the emperor as evidence of the fact, p. 352.*

† See Anastas. Life of Leo III., in the *vitis pontificum*.

‡ See ep. 92 to Arno archbishop of Salzburg. He appeals to the apocryphal fragments of ecclesiastical law, which were subsequently adopted into the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals*.

## SECTION THIRD.

## CHRISTIAN LIFE AND CHRISTIAN WORSHIP.

OWING to the vast extent of the territory over which Christianity spread, among the races which planted themselves on the ruins of the Roman empire, it was of course only by slow degrees that it could so operate as to exert its true influence on the minds of men—only by gradual steps that it could penetrate the masses. In proportion to the facility with which the earlier superstition might reappear under a Christian dress, finding as it did so convenient a foothold in the foreign elements which had already attached themselves to the Christian faith, as in the doctrines of the magical effects of the sacraments and of the worship of saints ; in proportion to the tendency of the earlier sinful habits of the nations to lay hold of these superstitions as a prop ; in the same proportion was the need of an uninterrupted course of religious instruction, in order that, upon the basis of the external church, an impulse might be given to the further internal development of the kingdom of God. This need was strongly affirmed also by the synods, which were occupied in devising measures for improving the condition of the church. The council of Cloveshove, as we have already noticed,\* made it the special duty of bishops, in visiting their churches, to preach the word of God to the inhabitants of every place ; which at the same time however, implied that these persons otherwise seldom had opportunity of hearing such preaching.† In the rule of bishop Chrodegang of Metz,‡ it was laid down, that the word of salvation should be preached twice a month, though it would be still better if it could be heard on all Sundays and feast-days, and so as to be understood by the people. Charlemagne was fully impressed with the conviction, that the well-being of the church depended on

\* P. 148.

† Utpote eos, qui raro audiunt verbum Dei, c. 3.

‡ C. 44. D'Achery spicileg. I. 574.

the right performance of the duty of preaching; and to this he exhorted the clergy on every suitable occasion.\* The persons also, with whom he was accustomed to consult on ecclesiastical affairs, confirmed him in this opinion. Alcuin is especially to be named among those who understood the importance of preaching as a means of promoting the Christian life, and who sought to interest the bishops in the performance of this duty, as constituting the most important branch of their vocation.† And in order that they might be qualified for this, he exhorted them to a diligent study of the bible.‡ In a letter of exhortation addressed to the people of Canterbury,§ he says “Without the Holy Scriptures, it is impossible to come to the right knowledge of God; and if the blind lead the blind, both fall into the ditch. On the other hand, the multitude of the wise is the safety of the people. Provide yourselves with teachers of the Holy Scriptures, that there may be no lack among you of the word of God; that you may never fail to have among you such as are able to guide the people; that the fountain of truth among you may not be dried up.” In a letter to the emperor Charles, he earnestly insists, that not only bishops, but priests, and deacons should preach; and if it were actually the case that the bishops hindered them from so doing,—if the priests and deacons did not use this as a mere pretext to exculpate themselves, he calls upon the emperor to provide some remedy for

\* An example of his exhortation to the bishops: *Ut magis ac magis in sancta Dei ecclesia studiose ac vigilanti cura laborare studeas in prædicatione ac doctrina salutari, quatenus per tuam devotissimam sollertia verbum vite æternæ crescat et currat et multiplicetur numerus populi Christiani in laudem et gloriam salvatoris nostri Dei.* See Mabillon *Analector.* Tom. I. page 22.

† E. g. ep. 193, his letter of congratulation to Theodulf archbishop of Orleans, when the latter had received the pallium from Rome: *Sicut regium diadema fulgor gemmarum ornat, ita fiducia prædicationis pallii ornare debet honorem. In hoc enim honorem suum habet, si portitor veritatis prædicator existit. Memor esto, sacerdotalis dignitatis linguam colestis esse clavem imperii et clarissimam castrorum Christi tubam; quapropter ne sileas, ne taceas, ne formides loqui, habens ubique operis tui itinerisque Christum socium et adjutorem. Mæsis quidem multa est, operarii autem pauci, eo instantiores qui sunt, esse necesse est.*

‡ Ep. 9, to an English archbishop: *Lectio scripturæ sæpius tuis reperiatur in manibus, ut ex illa te saturare et alios pascere valeas.*

\* § Ep. 59.

the evil.\* To show the propriety of this, he refers to *Revelation* xxii. 17. "Whoever thirsts, let him come: and whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely," where he supposes it therefore to be implied, that the water of life should be offered to all by the clergy, preaching the word. He also quotes the apostle Paul, who says (1 Cor. xiv. 30,) that all should prophesy, that is teach, in their turn; and 1 Tim. v. 17, "Let them only inform themselves," says he, "of the many and wonderful preachers, from different classes of the clergy, that have appeared in the history of the world; and let them but cease considering that as belonging only to a few, which, to the great advantage of souls, may be common to a great many. Why are homilies publicly read in the churches by clergymen of all grades? It were strange if all were allowed to *read* these, but might not explain them to the common understanding. What would this signify, but that the hearers must remain without fruit?" † We may here observe, how important it seemed to this great man, that Christian knowledge should be diffused among the laity, and that they should participate understandingly in the public worship of God. He was firmly convinced, also, that the formation of God's kingdom was a concern which by no means belonged exclusively to the clergy, but one which ought to be shared by all Christians. Far was he from wishing to confine the study of the divine work to ecclesiastics as their exclusive province; on the contrary, he expresses gratification whenever he finds the laity also engaged in such studies. He wished the emperor Charles might have many such diligent searchers of the scriptures among his ministers of state. §

\* See ep. 124, *audio per ecclesias Christi quandam consuetudinem non satis laudabilem, quam vestra auctoritas facile emendare potest, si tamen vera est opinio et non magis falsa excusatio, ut quod facere non volunt presbiteri, suis injiciant episcopis.*

† The homilies of the church fathers, arranged with reference to Sundays and feast-days, see below.

‡ *Et impleatur Virgilianum illud: Dat sine mente sonos.*

§ In his ep. 124, to the emperor Charlemagne, in allusion to Matth. xxv. 21, *nec enim hoc solis sacerdotibus vel clericis audiendum ibi arbitraris, sed etiam bonis laicis et bene in opere Dei laborantibus dicendum esse credas et maxime his, qui in sublimioribus positi sunt dignitatibus, quorum conversatio bona et vitae sanctitas et admonitoria aeternae salutis verba suis subjectis praedicatio poterit esse.* And in the same letter, referring

While the emperor, following the advice of such men, earnestly recommended to the bishops\* the duty of providing for the religious instruction of the people, the synods held under his reign made the same thing an object of special attention. The council of Mentz, in 813 (can. 25,) decreed, that, in case the bishop were absent, or sick, or otherwise hindered, still there should not fail to be some one present, on Sundays and feast-days, who could preach the word of God so as to be understood by the people ;† and in the same year the sixth council of Arles directed that the priests should preach not only in all the cities, but also in all country parishes.‡ Among those who laboured earnestly in the work of religious instruction, Theodulf, archbishop of Orleans, particularly distinguished himself. His instructions to his parochial priests (*Capitulare ad parochiæ suæ sacerdotes*) furnish a living testimony to the zeal and wisdom with which he administered his pastoral office.§ He admonishes his clergy, in these instructions, to be always prepared for the instruction of their flocks. Whoever understood the holy Scriptures, should explain them ; whoever did not, should hold forth to the flock what he knew best, that they should eschew evil and do good. No one could excuse himself on the ground that he wanted a tongue to edify others. The moment they saw one in a wrong way, they should do their utmost to reclaim him. And when they met their bishop at a synod, each should report what success had attended his labours ; and they would find him ready to lend them a cheerful assistance, according to his ability, wherever they needed it.

It is plain from these slight requisitions, which were all to a layman, who had proposed to him a query respecting the interpretation of a passage of scripture : *vere et valde gratum habeo, laicos quan-  
doque ad evangelicas effloruisse quæstiones, dum quendam audivit virum  
prudentem aliquando dicere, clericorum esse evangelium discere, non  
laicorum. Tamen iste laicus quisquis fuit, sapiens est corde, et si mani-  
bus miles, quales vestram auctoritatem plurimos habere decet.*

\* Gheerbold bishop of Liege says himself of the emperor, in his pastoral letter to his flock : *Excitat pigritiam nostram, ut non dormiamus et prædicationis officium unusquisque consideret.* Mansi Consil. T. XIII. f. 1084.

† *Qui verbum Dei prædictet, juxta quod intelligere vulgus possit.*

‡ C. 10. *ut non solum in civitatibus, sed etiam in omnibus parochiis presbyteri ad populum verbum faciant.*

§ C. 28. Harduin. Concil. T. III. f. 918.

that Theodulf found it in his power to demand of his clergy, how exceedingly deficient the majority of ecclesiastics were in that culture, and knowledge of the scriptures which were needed for the successful discharge of the duties of their calling; and this is confirmed, when we compare them with other requisitions laid down by the synods; as for example, when it is supposed as a possible case, that the priests, in public worship, might do no more than mechanically repeat the liturgical forms in Latin, without understanding them. In reference to this, the synod at Cloveshove directed, in their tenth canon, that the priests should be able to translate and expound, in the language of the country, the creed, the Lord's prayer, and the liturgical forms used at the celebration of mass and in baptism; they should thus endeavour to understand the spiritual sense of the offices they performed, so as not to be dumb and ignorant instruments.\*

There could be no improvement, therefore, in the religious instruction of the people until more care was bestowed on the education of the clergy. And this was to be aimed at in the schools established by the bishops and parochial clergy, as well as in the monasteries. Hence the establishment of schools was another object which commanded great attention in the times of Charlemagne. Thus the second council of Chalons, in 813, decreed in their third canon, that the bishops should found schools for giving instruction in the other sciences and also in the expounding of scripture, and where persons might be so educated, that our Saviour could truly say of them, "Ye are the salt of the earth."† But, for the present, there was a great want of ecclesiastics capable of directing the religious instruction of the communities, according to the ordinances of those synods. To supply the wants of such as were unable to compose sermons of their own, collections of discourses, by the older church-teachers, had been formed already at an earlier period, which were to be publicly read

\* Ne vel in ipsis intercessionibus, quibus pro populi delictis Deum exorare poscuntur vel ministerii sui officiis inveniantur quasi muti et ignavi, si non intelligunt nec verborum suorum sensum nec sacramenta; quibus per eos alii ad aeternam proficiunt salutem.

† Et qui conditum pleibus esse valeant et quorum doctrina non solum diversis haeresibus, verum etiam antichristi monitis et ipsi antichristo resistatur.

in the churches during the time of divine service. But as these collections (Homiliaria) had suffered various corruptions, through the ignorance of these centuries, the emperor Charles ordered an improved collection to be prepared by one of his clergy, Paul Warnefrid, or Paulus Diaconus, from the abbey of Monte Cassino. This work, he published himself for the use of the churches, with a preface, in which he admonished the clergy, by his own example, to a diligent study of the sacred scriptures ; stating, that he had endeavoured by his own labours on the text, to provide himself with a correct copy of the bible.\* Now as in this Homilarium the sermons were arranged in the order of Sundays and feast-days, and as that arrangement of biblical texts was laid at the foundation, which had been gradually formed in the church of Rome since the time of Gregory the Great, it thus came about, that the textual arrangement of this church was more widely diffused, and greater uniformity in this respect secured. For the rest, with regard to this collection, which relieved the clergy from the necessity of exertion, and furnished them with an encouragement to indolence, it was no doubt calculated upon that the sermons, when read to the congregations, would be translated into the vernacular tongue ; a thing which was expressly directed by several councils of this period.†

We see from what has thus far been said, that in the Carolingian age, there was certainly no wish to banish from public worship in the Frankish church the use of the popular tongue ; but rather a desire to encourage it. But by the force of custom, the Latin had already been a long time established as the predominant liturgical language. In the countries belonging to the Roman empire, the Roman was, indeed, the

\* Ad pernoscenda etiam sacrorum librorum studia nostro etiam quos possumus invitamus exemplo. Inter quae jampridem universos veteris ac novi testamenti libros librariorum imperitia depravatos Deo nos in omnibus adjuvante examussim correximus. See Mabillon *Analectorum T. I.* pag. 26.

† As for example, by the second council of Rheims, in the year 813, in the 15th canon, *ut episcopi sermones et homilias S. Patrum, prout omnes intelligere possint, secundum proprietatem linguae prædicare studeant*, and by the third council of Tours, in the same year, c. 17, *ut easdem homilias quisque aperte transferre studeat in rusticam Romanam linguam aut Theotiscam, quo facilius cuncti possint intelligere, quæ dicuntur.*

language generally current and understood ; and hence there could be no necessity of translating the church hymns and the liturgical forms into the old popular tongues, the use of which had been long suppressed or restricted by the language of Rome. But now, wherever races of German origin had settled in Roman provinces, the seats of Roman culture, there the Roman language still held its ground, as the language of refinement and of courts, and also as the liturgical language ; and it was only by slow degrees that a particular dialect sprang out of the mixture of the Roman language with the new popular tongue. The missionaries that went from the church of Rome followed also the ancient custom, and could not prevail on themselves to make use of the barbarous tongues of the people to whom they brought Christianity, for the purpose of translating into them the divine word and the liturgical formulas : until, by degrees, from the practice of the church it grew to be a principle in theory, that the Roman language should be considered pre-eminently the language of the church. The striving after conformity with the church of Rome naturally promoted an attachment to the liturgy as expressed in the Roman language and form ; while the latter again would react upon the former. King Pipin no doubt found a Latin church psalmody already existing in the Frankish church, which had been transmitted downward from the ancient Gallic church. But as this differed originally from the Roman church psalmody, especially since Gregory the Great had done so much to improve the music of the church, and as it had moreover been corrupted by the barbarism of the intervening time, Pipin endeavoured to restore it after the model of the church music at Rome ; wishing here, as elsewhere, to make Frankish barbarism give way to superior refinement, and to bring the Frankish church into agreement with the Roman,\* after the example of Boniface ; wherein he was zealously sustained by that warm friend of decency and order in church regulations, Chrodegang, bishop of Metz.†

\* In the capitulary of the emperor Charles of the year 789, which was issued at Aix la Chapelle, it is said of Pipin (c. 78) : Gallicanum cantum tulit ob unanimitatem apostolice sedis et ecclesiae pacificam concordiam ; and in the preface to the homilies, totas Galliarum ecclesias suo studio Romanæ traditionis cantibus decoravit.

† Paul Warnefrid, or Paul the Deacon, says, in the *gestis episcoporum*

Roman psalmody, however, was soon altered again by the peculiarity of the French pronunciation ; while, at the same time, it was found impossible to suppress entirely the old Gallic form of church music by the new regulations of Pipin ; and hence the emperor Charles, when attending the high festivals at Rome, could not but notice the great difference between the Franco-Gallic and the Gregorian church music of Rome. Hence he was led to desire that the Frankish psalmody might be altered and improved wholly after the pattern of the Roman.\* His friend pope Hadrian, to enable him to accomplish what he desired, gave him, as assistants in remodelling the Frankish church music, the two most skilful singers in his own church, Theodore and Benedict ; and presented him with a number of Roman chants (Antiphonarii).† By means of two musical schools, one established at Soissons, the other at Metz, the last of which was the most distinguished, the entire music of the French church was remodelled after the Roman form.‡

Mettensium, respecting bishop Chrodegang : *Ipsum clerum abundanter lege divina Romanaque imbutum cantilena morem atque ordinem Romanæ ecclesie servare præcepit, quod usque ad id tempus in Metensi ecclesia factum minime fuit.* Monumenta Germanicæ historica ed. Pertz, T. II. f. 268.

\* Thus, in the annales Einhardi, in an appendix, at the year 786, it is related that on the Easter festival in Rome a contest arose between the Roman church-singers and the Franks brought along with him by the emperor, the former calling the latter *rusticos et indectos velut bruta animalia*. The emperor decided the quarrel by saying that men ought to go back to the fountain-head, rather than to follow the brooks that flow from it. *Revertimini vos ad fontem S. Gregorii, quia manifeste corruptissimam cantilena ecclesiasticam.* The anecdotes told after his own style by the monk of St. Gall, are less deserving of credit.

† In the passage referred to it is said : *Correcti sunt ergo antiphonarii Francorum, quos unusquisque pro arbitrio suo vitiaverat, addens vel minuens et omnes Francie cantores didicerunt notam Romanam, quam nunc vocant notam Franciscam ; excepto quod tremulas vel vinnulas (h. e. lenes et molles) sive collisibiles et secabiles voces in cantu non poterant perfecte exprimere.* Franci, naturali voce barbarica frangentes in giture voces potius quam exprimentes.

‡ From the French church proceeded the use of the organ, the first musical instrument employed in the church. A present of the emperor Constantine Copronymus to king Pipin gave occasion to its use. Annal. Einhard, a. 757, hence the Greek name *organum*. But what is said in these Annals (i. e. at the year 786) seems to presuppose, that the art of playing on the organ, and of using it in divine service, was first brought

Thus, it is true, that under the reign of Charlemagne the use of the Latin language in the worship of the Frankish church, although not first introduced, was yet, by a closer connection with the church of Rome, more firmly established; but at the same time, the notion was expressly contradicted, that certain languages only could be employed for religious purposes. "Let no man believe that God may be prayed to only in three languages; for in every language God may be adored, and man will be heard, if he prays aright."\* Now while it is true, that if the missionaries of this time, following the example of Ulphilas, had given the people the Bible in their own language, and introduced it into the public worship, much would have been done to promote the worship of God in spirit and in truth; so, on the other hand, the employment of a language which was not generally understood, actually served to promote a worship consisting in mechanical forms or in vague and undefined feelings, and to open an easier way for the entrance of superstition.

Special care was necessary not only to counteract the various superstitions of paganism, which still kept their hold of the rude multitude—such as resorting to amulets for the cure of diseases, and for the prevention of unlucky accidents,†—but also to hinder the old superstition from reappearing under some Christian form, by attaching itself to Christian practices not rightly understood. In this way had arisen such abuses,

to perfection in the church of Rome: *Similiter erudierunt Romani cantores supradicti, see above, cantores Francorum in arte organandi.* And if it seems to be inconsistent with this, that a century later, pope John VIII. obtained from the church at Freysingen, a good organ, and a skilful organist (*Vid. Baluz. Miscellan. T. V.*) we must suppose that afterwards the Frankish church excelled the Roman in this art. This may be explained as owing to the declension of the church of Rome in the next following times.

\* In the capitulary issued at Frankfort on the Maine, of the year 795, c. 50: *Ut nullus credat, quod non nisi in tribus linguis Deus orandus sit, quia in omni lingua Deus adoratur, et homo exauditur, si justa petierit.*

† Against these, the council of Auxerre (*Antissiodorens*) of the year 578, c. 5.: *Quaecunque homo facere vult, omnia in nomine Domini faciat.* In a capitulary of the emperor Charles of the year 814, c. 10: *Ut inquirantur sortilegi et aruspices et qui menses et tempora observant et qui omina observant, et ita phylacteria circa collum portant nescimus quibus verbis scriptis;* and in the third capitulary of the year 789, c. 18: *Ne chartas per perticas appendant propter grandinem.*

for example, as the following. The Scriptures, instead of being searched for the purpose of finding the way of everlasting salvation, were turned over for an oracular response to some question of moment relating to the immediate temporal future. He who was about to engage in an important or hazardous undertaking, would open the Bible, and interpret the first passage that met his eye as an oracle addressed to him. Or the same use was made of such words of Scripture as one happened to hear read or sung as he entered a church.\* A very common custom was, to place on the tomb of some saint, as that in the famous church of St. Martin of Tours, a volume of the gospels or some other book of Scripture, and, after due preparation by prayer and fasting, to turn open a page, when the first passage that occurred was considered as a response given by the saint (*sortes sanctorum*).† But although this practice seemed to be hallowed by a certain air of Christianity, yet the voice of the ecclesiastical synods was opposed to it from the beginning. The first council of Orleans decreed,‡ in the year 511, that clergymen and monks, who consented to be employed as instruments in obtaining such responses, § as well as those who believed in them, should be excommunicated from the church; and this prohibition was repeated by the council of Auxerre, in 578.|| But a branch of superstition so intimately connected with the whole religious mode of thinking, could not be extirpated by such single ordinances; the emperor Charles was obliged to issue a new law against it.¶

Another mode of appealing to the judgment of God, which found its way into the administration of justice, was still more intimately blended with the manners and opinions of these races. We find it a prevailing sentiment among nations of.

\* When Clovis was about to make war on the West Goths in Spain, he prayed God that he would reveal to him, as he entered the church of St. Martin, a fortunate issue of the war; and as at that moment the words of Ps. xviii. 40, 41, were chanted the king regarded this as an infallible oracle, by which he was assured of the victory. He in fact obtained the victory, which confirmed him in his belief. Gregor. Turon. Hist. I. II. c. 37.

† An example in Gregor. Turon. I. V. c. 14.      ‡ Aurelianense I.

§ C. 30, *sortes, quas mentiuntur esse sanctorum.*      || C. 4.

¶ In the third capitulary of the year 789, c. 4: *Ut nullus in psalterio vel in evangelio vel in aliis rebus sortire presumat.*

opposite quarters of the earth,—nations of German descent, as well as in China, Japan,\* India,† and among the ancient Greeks,‡—that nature itself, in contested questions, was ready to appear as a witness in behalf of justice and of innocence. At the bottom of this lay the belief in a moral government of the world, to which nature itself was subservient; and the more unskilled and unpractised the understanding in bringing the truth to light by investigation, the more inclined were men to summon to their aid an immediate judgment from heaven. Thus it came about, particularly among these races of German origin, that the revelation of guilt or of innocence was expected in contested questions, from the issue of a combat, or from the effects of the elements of fire and water. In the form under which the theocratical principle, which Christianity introduced, was understood by these races, this *judgment of God* might easily find a point of attachment. Yet Avitus, bishop of Vienne, protested in the strongest terms against the practice, when introduced by king Gundobad into the Burgundian legislation. This monarch contended, that in war the judgment of God decided between nations, and gave the victory to the party which had the right. Avitus answered him: If sovereigns and their people respected the judgment of God, they would tremble first at the words of the 68th Psalm (v. 30), “He scattereth the people that delight in war;” and they would act according to what is written in Romans xii. 19, “Vengeance is mine: I will repay, saith the Lord.” Had not divine justice power to decide, without resorting to javelins and swords? Whereas in war the party in the wrong had often been known to obtain the victory, by superior force or cunning.§ But such isolated voices sounded feebly, in opposition to ancient customs and the prevailing spirit of the times. The judgments of God were received into the systems of jurisprudence; and even Charlemagne, who combated superstitious opinions of a kindred nature, yielded in this case to the spirit of his age,

\* See Kämpfer *Amoenitates exoticæ*.

† Compare Rosenmüller's *altes und neues Morgenland*, B. II. p. 226.

‡ See Sophocles *Antigone*.

§ The words of Avitus, in the book of Agobard of Lyons, *adversus legem Gundobadi*.

and gave these judgments of God the sanction of his approbation.\*

Men were inclined to seek justification in outward works,—in gifts to churches, especially those dedicated to the memory of saints, in adorning them with costly ornaments, in the distribution of alms; thus relaxing the strictness of Christianity in requiring an entire change of inward disposition. Still, instances were not wanting of a reaction of the Christian spirit against delusions, which served so directly to encourage security in sin. Thus the emperor Charles, in a capitulary of the year 811, addressed to the bishops and abbots,† says: “In seeking to have fine churches, we should not overlook the genuine ornament of the church, which consists in correctness of manners; for great pains bestowed on the erection of churches belongs, in a certain sense, to the times of the Old Testament; but the emendation of manners belongs peculiarly to the New Testament and to Christian discipline.”‡ Theodulf of Orleans says, in his “Instructions to the Parochial Clergy,” “It is our duty, indeed, to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, to visit the sick and those in prison, and to show hospitality to strangers. Matt. xxv. ; but of little avail towards securing everlasting life will all this be to him who gives himself up to gluttony, to pride, and other vices, and who neglects other good works. It is needful to remind the people that true charity is seen only in this, that a man loves God more than himself, and his neighbour as himself—in this, that he does not conduct towards others as he would not wish that others should conduct towards himself; for they who make charity consist in merely bestowing food, drink,

\* In a law of the year 809. *ut omnes judicio Dei credant absque dubitatione.* Baluz. Capitular. T. I. f. 466. The proof of innocence in case of a murder, in the capitulary of the year 803: *ad novem vomeres ignitos judicio Dei examinandus accedat.* I. c. f. 389. That a vassal of the bishop submitted to a judgment of God to prove his innocence against the charge of high treason. See in the capitulary of the year 794, l. c. f. 265.

† Mansi. T. XIII. f. 1073.

‡ *Quamvis bonum sit, ut ecclesiae pulchra sint aedificia, preferendus tamen est aedificiis bonorum morum ornatus et culmen, quia, in quantum nobis videtur, structio basilicarum veteris legis quandam trahit consuetudinem, morum autem emendatio proprie ad novum testamentum et Christianem pertinet disciplinam.*

and other outward gifts, are in no slight error; for the apostle says, 'The kingdom of God consists not in meat and drink.' All this, too, is then only good when done out of love." The second council of Chalons, in 813, denounced\* the false confidence placed in the opus operatum of pilgrimages to Rome and to the church of St. Martin of Tours. "There were ecclesiastics of a careless life, who imagined themselves cleansed from sin, and qualified to perform the duties of their station—laymen, who supposed they could sin, or had sinned, with impunity, because they undertook such pilgrimages; nobles, who, under the same pretext, practised extortion on their subjects; poor men, who did it to secure a better chance of begging; as, for example, those that roamed the country, falsely pretending that they were about to set out on a pilgrimage, or who were so foolish as to believe that by the mere sight of a holy place they should be cleansed from their sins, not thinking of those words of St. Jerome, that it was no praise to have seen Jerusalem, but to have led a good life there." Those pilgrimages alone were here accounted commendable, which had originated in motives of sincere piety, and aimed at the emendation of the whole life.† Thus Alcuin wrote to a nun whose conscience troubled her, because she had been unable to perform the pilgrimage on which she had started: "This was no great harm; for God had chosen some better thing for her; she had now only to expend in supporting the poor, what she had appropriated to so long a journey."‡ Theodulf of Orleans wrote against this over-valuation of pilgrimages to Rome in one of his minor poems, where he says: It is only by a pious life a man can find his way to heaven, no matter whether he lives at Rome or elsewhere.§

The exaggerated veneration paid to saints and to the Virgin

\* C. 45.

† Qui vero peccata sua sacerdotibus, in quorum sunt parochiis, confessi sunt, et ab his agende penitentiae consilium acceperunt, si orationibus insistendo, eleemosynas largiendo, vitam emendando, mores componendo apostolorum limina vel quorumlibet sanctorum invisere desiderant, horum est devotionis modis omnibus collaudanda.

‡ See ep. 147.

§ Non tantum esse juvat Romanam, bene vivere quantum  
Vel Romam vel ubi vita agitur hominis,  
Non via credo pedum; sed moram ducit ad astra  
Quis quid ubique gerit, spectat ab arce Deus.

Mary, concerning the origin of which we spoke in the preceding period, presented, by the deifying of human beings in their individual capacity, the readiest channel for the admission of those elements of pagan ideas which had not been vanquished by Christianity. Although the veneration of saints was determined and limited in the church system of doctrine by its connection with the whole Christian consciousness of God and Christian worship of God—for it was only the grace of God, exhibited in the saints as his instruments, which was to be adored, and only the mediating sympathy of the just made perfect which was to be sought after in them;—yet in common life, the saints who were peculiarly venerated became a sort of guardian deities, to whom men were wont to resort in all times of danger and sickness, and in all weighty undertakings; and the reference of the whole self-conscious man to God revealed in Christ, the sense of fellowship with God obtained by Christ for every believer, was thereby greatly hindered. Furthermore, as the feeling of the need of redemption, in its religious and moral significance, ceased to form the ground-tone of the inward life, the great object of prayer, with invocation of the saints, was rather to seek deliverance from physical evils, than salvation from sin and from moral wretchedness. The pagan element discovered itself in both ways; in the deification of human attributes, and in the sensuous direction given to the religious need. Bishop Gregory of Tours thanks God for the gift of such a physician as Martin, in expressions sometimes like those of a Christian who thanks God for a Saviour, sometimes like those of a pagan speaking of Esculapius.\* He affirms that the bare touch of his tomb stopped hemorrhages, gave the cripple strength to stand erect, restored sight to the blind, and even banished away sorrow from the heart. In all bodily complaints of his own he repaired thither, and applied the suffering part to St. Martin's tomb, or to the hangings by which it was inclosed. To be sure, he requires, as the necessary condition of obtaining relief, the true devotion of a penitent spirit;†

\* Gregory, in the beginning of the third book on the miracles of St. Martin: *gratias agimus omnipotenti Deo, qui nobis talēm medicum tribuere dignatus est, qui infirmitates nostras purgaret, vulnera dilueret ac salubria medicamenta conferret.*

† *Si ad ejus beatum tumulum humilietur animus et oratio sublimetur,*

and no doubt, the impression made on the feelings by the spot, with which were associated in the minds of the men of this age, by all they had been told from childhood, so many sacred recollections, might sometimes produce a salutary thrill of emotion; and hence, perhaps, it may be explained how criminals might here be brought to confess their guilt, or how the suddenly awakened anguish of remorse might reveal itself to them in menacing visions, or a powerful shock of the nervous system predispose them to sudden attacks of illness. Yet we also meet with cases, where St. Martin is invoked precisely after the manner of a pagan deity; as, when he is addressed in the following style: "If thou dost not perform what I request of thee, we will here burn for thee no more lamps, nor pay thee any honours at all,"\* and the objects taken off from the places about the holy tomb, were applied to the same uses as any amulet of pagan superstition.† Such being the tendency of the popular mind,‡ it

si defluant lacrimæ et compunctio vera succedat, si ab inio corde emit-tantur suspiria, invenit ploratus latitiam, culpa veniam, dolor pectoris pervenit ad medelam.

\* See Gregor. Turon. de miraculis Martini, l. III. c. 8.

† Gregory of Tours, having observed that one of his vineyards was ruined every year by hail-storms, fastened a piece of wax, taken from the vicinity of the tomb, on one of the tallest trees, and from that time the place was spared, de miraculis Martini, l. I. c. 34. Oil was used as an amulet, to cure a disease among cattle, de miraculis Martini, l. III. c. 18.

‡ A monk, who had already in his lifetime acquired the character of a miracle-worker, requested that he might not be buried in his cloister, foreseeing that after his death multitudes of the people would be continually flocking to his grave, in order to be cured of their diseases. Gregor. Turon. vita patrum, c. I. Vain-minded bishops now aspired to the honour of having it said, that miracles were wrought in their name. A characteristic anecdote on this point is related by the monk of St. Gall.<sup>1</sup> One who had failed of gaining the favour of his bishop and feudal lord, finally resorted with success to the following expedient. Having entrapped a fox without injuring the animal, he brought it as a present to bishop Recho. As the bishop was wondering how he managed to catch the fox with so little harm to the creature, the man said: When the fox was in full chase, I cried out to it, In the name of my Lord Recho, stop and keep still! So the fox stood immovable till I seized him. The bishop was well pleased to find that his sanctity had so plainly revealed itself, and the man had won his favour forever. Even if the story were not true, it may none the less be considered as a characteristic satire taken from the life of the times. Monachi Sangallensis gesta Caroli M. l. I. c. 20.

would now follow, as a very natural consequence, that deception in the use of pretended relics would be common,\* or that those least entitled to the name would be honoured, their death, as saints. To put a stop to such abuses, the emperor Charles, in a capitulary issued at Frankfort on the Maine,† in 794, directed, that no new saints should be worshipped, and no chapels erected to their memory on the public highways; but those only should be worshipped in the church who had been raised to this honour by virtue of their sufferings or the worthiness of their lives.

The number of festivals, additional to the high festivals of the ancient church, had increased, up to the end of this period, in the Western church, (as we find from a list drawn up by a council of Mentz in 813,)‡ to the following extent. First, there were *two festivals of Mary*. As Christmas was naturally followed by the celebration of many other festivals relating to the infancy of Christ, so there arose, in the Greek church, the festival of Christ's presentation in the temple, Luke ii. 25; referring to the recognition of the child Jesus as the Messiah, by Simeon and Anna—hence called in the Greek church the ἐορτὴ ἵπαντῆς (τοῦ κυρίου). But in the Western church, the worship of Mary caused it to be changed into a festival of Mary; under which name this feast is noticed by the council of Mentz—as the festum purificationis Mariæ. The habit of comparing Mary with Christ led men gradually to believe that something of a miraculous nature must have been connected both with the beginning and the end of her earthly life; and the silence of the gospels on the subject of her death left here ample room for legendary tradition.§ This led to the festival of the assumption (assumptio Mariæ). Next followed, as *octave to the festival of Christmas, the festival of Christ's Circumcision*, which was set over against the pagan celebration of New year's day. Furthermore, there was the *feast of St. Michael*, the occasion of which was as follows. The Apocalypse had set to work the imagi-

\* See Gregor. Turon. hist. l. IX. c. 6. † C. 40. ‡ C. 35.

§ The legends finally reduced to form in Gregory of Tours *de gloria martyrum*, l. I. c. 4. When Mary was near the point of death, all the apostles assembled around her bed, and watched with her. Then appeared Christ with his angels, and committed her soul to the archangel Gabriel; but her body was taken away in a cloud.

nations of men to invent fictions about the archangel Michael; and many were the stories about visions in which he was described as having appeared. With the story of such an appearance was finally connected in the Roman church the feast of St. Michael, dedicatio sancti Michaelis, as it was called by the council of Mentz, in reference to the dedication of a church in Rome, where an appearance of this sort was said to have occurred. The idea of this feast is the communion of believers on earth with the higher world of perfected spirits — the memory of the church triumphant. Furthermore, there was the *simultaneous festival, which originated in the fifth century, in honour of the martyrdom of St. Peter and of St. Paul, Dies natalis apostolorum Petri et Pauli.* The *nativity of John the Baptist*, the only one which, besides the nativity of Christ, was celebrated in the church, and that on account of its connection with the latter. Next are particularly mentioned, the *natales* of Andrew, of Remigius (of Rheims), and of Martin; and for each several diocese the particular festivals of the saints which were buried in them; and festivals commemorating the dedication of particular churches. In this age arose also another festival, not named by this council, which afterwards obtained general validity. In the Greek church was first introduced a feast in memory of all the saints, which, inasmuch as the whole number of saints represents the collective sum of the effects of the Holy Spirit, was properly observed as an octave to the festival of Pentecost. But in the Western church, the founding of the same festival grew out of a particular occasion. Boniface IV., who became pope in the year 610, having at his own request been presented, by the Greek emperor Phocas, with the Pantheon in Rome, following out the pagan idea, converted this temple into a church dedicated to Mary and all the saints, which now suggested the idea of founding a festival of this import. Alcuin particularly designates this festival as the feast of the glorification of human nature by Christ, in the consciousness that men were now endowed with so much power as instruments of the Holy Spirit — the feast of spiritual communion with the perfected members of the church.\*

\* Alcuin (ep. 76) to Arno, archbishop of Salzburg: quoniam si Elias unus ex illis in veteri testamento oratione sua dum voluit claudere cœlum

We observed, in the preceding period, how the idea of the Lord's supper as a sacrifice, which had proceeded from a purely Christian element, became gradually transformed from the symbolical into a magical import. In this respect, Gregory the Great appears especially to represent the Christian spirit of the age ever inclining more and more to the magical. The idea that the holy supper should represent, in a lively form, to the believing heart, the redemptive sufferings of Christ, whereby mankind became reconciled to God—and the communion between Heaven and earth, was restored—this idea took, for him, the meaning: that whenever the priest presents this offering, heaven opens at his voice; the choirs of angels appear; the high and the low, the earthly and the heavenly, unite; the visible and the invisible become one.\* Who may not recognize here a heart deeply penetrated with the consciousness of what had been done by the redemption; though the truth at bottom, from being connected with the false view of the priesthood, and the false notion, grounded therein, of the sacrificial act of the priest, from being transferred to this isolated, outward act, received an erroneous application? Now Gregory, by looking at the sacrifice of the supper in this connection, could say: What must be the efficacy of this sacrifice, which continually imitates and repeats for us the redemptive passion of Christ?†. But still Gregory did not apprehend this idea of a sacrifice in a barely outward manner, but in connection with the whole bent and tendency of the inward life, as did Augustin; for he reckoned, as belonging to the living appropriation of this sacrifice, the spiritual offering of one's self, the surrendry of the whole life to the Redeemer, in an absolute self-renunciation.‡. But although he could apprehend, after this manner, the doctrine

*potuit prævaricatoribus et aperire conversis, quanto magis omnes sancti in novo testamento, ubi eis specialiter et patenter claves regni cœlestis commisæ sunt et claudere eorum possunt meridulis et aperire credentibus, si intima dilectione honorificantur, a fidelibus et honorificantur glorificatione eis condigna.*

\* See Gregor. Dial. I. IV. c. 58.

† *Quæ illam nobis mortem per mysterium reparat, pro absolutione nostra passionem unigeniti semper imitatur. Christus iterum in hoc mysterio sacre oblationis immolatur.*

‡ *Sed necesse est, ut cum hœc agimus nosmetipos Deo in cordis contritione mactemus, quia qui passionis dominice mysteria celebramus, debemus imitari quod agimus. Tunc ergo vere pro nobis hostia erit Deo, cum nos ipsos hostiam fecerimus.*

of the holy supper in its true religious and moral significance, as denoting the living appropriation of fellowship of the Redeemer, yet as a consequence resulting from that magical element, he connected with this the idea of an objective, magical efficacy of that sacrifice, capable of operating both on the living and on the dead.\*

As to its effect on departed souls, this was connected with that other notion, which also had come down from the previous period,† of a purgatorial fire destined for those Christians who, though on the whole in a state of saving faith (that is of faith working by love), were still working with many clogs of sin, for which they must suffer, and from which they must be purified, and who had died in this state. Now the sacrifice offered for such, since the efficacy of Christ's passion was thereby appropriated to them, was to serve as a means of delivering them sooner from those purifying fires, and of enabling them to get to heaven. The stories which Gregory cites in his Dialogues in confirmation of these ideas, were peculiarly adapted, if we consider the prevailing bent of the age, to obtain currency for his views in the minds of men, whose religious feelings partook so strongly of the sensuous element, and who were governed more by an excited imagination than by the prudent dictates of the understanding. While then, in connection with the predominant Old Testament mode of considering the priesthood, this view of the Lord's supper became the prevailing one, the dangerous error now arose among the people of laying the greatest stress on the sacrificial act of the priest in behalf of the living and the dead. The priest was solicited, with valuable presents to say masses for the repose of departed souls; while the laity were more seldom disposed to participate in the communion. The thing was carried to such an extreme, that priests presented the offering of the mass alone and by themselves, without any participation of the congregation (the so-called missæ privatae). Efforts were made in the Carolingian period to remove this abuse also, which was so directly opposed to the

\* The presentation of this offering caused the chains to be removed from a distant captive, in whose behalf his faithful wife had offered it. In the same way, a seaman, tossed about by a storm in a small boat at sea, was supported by bread from heaven, and saved from foundering.

† See vol. II.

design of the institution of the Lord's supper; and many voices of the church alleged against it the ancient liturgical forms of celebrating the eucharist. Thus the council of Menthon, in 813, says, how can the priest pronounce the words: *Sursum corda, or Dominus vobiscum* (Raise your hearts—The Lord be with you), where none are present?\* Theodulf of Orleans brings up the same subject in his Instructions to the parochial clergy;† and objects to private masses, that our Lord said, Where two or three are assembled in my name, I will be in the midst of them. Hence too, it was found necessary to exhort the laity to a more frequent participation in the communion. This was done by the synod at Cloveshove, and by Theodulf of Orleans, who insists however upon the necessity of due preparation in order to participate worthily in the holy ordinance.‡

The ancient rules of church penance were transmitted also to this period. Yet some regard was paid, in the administration of church discipline, to the new relations which had sprung up among a barbarous people. Thus to those who *personally* confessed their sins to the priest,§ it was granted as a favour, that they should not be subjected to any *public* church penance, but only to penitential exercises which were to be performed in private. There was a deviation from the ancient laws of the church also in this, that to those who confessed their sins and declared their readiness to engage in the penitential exercises imposed on them, the priest might grant absolution at once, although they could not as yet be allowed to partake of the communion.|| And since in general,

\* C. 23.

† C. 7. It could not be celebrated sine salutatione sacerdotis, responsione nihilominus plebis.

‡ C. 44. admonendus est populus, ut nequaquam indifferenter accedat, nec ab hoc nimium abstineat, sed cum omni diligentia eligat tempus, quando aliquamdiu ab opere conjugali abstineat et vitiis se purget, virtutibus exornet, eleemosynis et orationibus insistat.

§ The distinction of peccata occulta from peccatis publicis, which latter came to the knowledge of the bishops by other witnesses, and were publicly punished according to their decisions at public tribunals (see what has been said above concerning the Sends).

|| Among the ordinances of Boniface,—where also it is spoken of as a compliance introduced by the circumstances of the times. *Et quia varia necessitate præpedimur, canonum statuta de conciliandis penitentibus pleniter observare, propterea omnino non dimittatur* (it should not be

there were now many things in the laws relating to church penance which could not be adapted to the new relations, or, amidst such relations could not be applied without encountering a violent opposition ; this circumstance led to changes which, oftentimes, were undertaken to be carried through in so arbitrary a manner as threatened to enfeeble the severity of church discipline, so wholesome for those rude times, and to encourage security in crimes. Whenever a real interest was felt to improve the condition of the church, as was the case in the Carolingian period, men endeavoured to banish the libelli poenitentiales (penitential certificates), which sprang into use in so abusive a manner, and to restore again the severity of the ecclesiastical laws.\* The directions for administering church penance, drawn up by Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury, by Egbert of York in the eighth century, and by Halitgar, bishop of Cambray, at the opening of the ninth century, were designed for the purpose of rendering the ancient laws of the church, relating to penance, applicable to the new relations and manners. Now these races of people were much accustomed to pecuniary mulets, which had been adopted also into the systems of jurisprudence ; so that by paying a certain specified fine, those who had been guilty of theft or of murder, could purchase exemption from the punishment due to those crimes ; and by a *composition*, could come to an understanding with those whom they had injured, or with the relations of those whom they had murdered. The regulations of church penance were now accommodated to these customs,† and a *composition* of this sort was received among

wholly omitted, everything should be done that was possible). Curet unusquisque presbyter statim post acceptam confessionem poenitentium singulos data oratione reconciliari. Würdtwein, f. 142.

\* So the second council of Chalons, c. 38, repudiatis penitus libellis, quos poenitentiales vocant, quorum sunt certi errores, incerti auctores. Qui dum pro peccatis gravibus leves quosdam et inusitatos imponunt poenitentiae modos, consuunt pulvillo secundum propheticum sermonem Ezech. xiii. sub omni cubito manus et faciunt cervicatia sub capite universæ etatis ad capiendas animas.

† Even a church-father of the fifth century, perhaps Maximus of Turin, felt constrained to speak earnestly against the abuse of indulgences practised by Arian ecclesiastics among the barbarian tribes, and which had sprung out of accommodation to these prevailing customs. See the passage already referred to in connection with another subject : Præpositi eorum, quos presbyteros vocant, dicuntur tale habere mandatum, ut si quis

the number of ecclesiastical punishments; or those who could not be induced to undertake certain kinds of church penance to which they should have been subjected according to the old laws of the church, were allowed to substitute for these a pecuniary fine proportionately estimated, and the money thus contributed was either to be given as alms to the poor, or paid for the ransom of captives, or for defraying the expenses of public worship.\* This was the first, in itself considered, innocent, occasion of indulgences. They were accordingly nothing else at first than a substitution for the church punishments hitherto customary, of others better suited to the manners of these races. But as it generally happened that some fatal misapprehension, whereby the barbarous people were made to feel secure in their sins, became easily attached not only to this, but to every kind of church penance, when the ecclesiastical tribunal was not duly distinguished from the divine, and the church absolution from the divine forgiveness of sins, and when penitence was not contemplated in its connection with the whole economy of Christian salvation,† so it happened here, that the practice of granting absolution for money soon gave birth to the fatal error, that it was possible in this way to purchase exemption from the punishment of sin, and to obtain its forgiveness. The false confidence in the merit of almagiving was in fact nothing new. Against this delusion, and the abuse resulting from it, many of the reforming synods of this period earnestly contended. Thus the synod of Cloveshove, so often mentioned before, declared in the year

laicorum fassus fuerit crimen admissum, non dicat illi: age poenitentiam; defle peccata; sed dicat: pro hoc criminis da tantum mihi et indulgetur tibi. Vanus plane et insipiens presbyter, qui cum ille prædam accipiat, putat, quod peccatum Christus indulget. Nescit, quia salvator solet peccata donare et pro delicto querere pretiosas lacrimas, non pecunias numerosas. Denique Petrus, cum ter negando Dominum delinquisset, veniam non muneribus meruit, sed lacrimis impetravit. Apud hujusmodi præceptores semper divites innocentes, semper pauperes criminosi. s. Mabillon Museum Italicum, T. I. P. II. p. 28.

\* Halitgar, liber poenitentialis, that whoever could not submit to the prescribed fasts, should pay a sum of money, proportionate to his means, for the determinate period of fasting remitted to him. Sed unusquisque attendat, cui dare debet, sive pro redemptione captivorum, sive super sanctum altare, sive pro pauperibus Christianis erogandum.

† See respecting the germ of these errors, the section relating to church-life. Vol. I. p. 223, and Vol. II. p. 221.

747, can. 26, that alms were, by no means, to be given under the impression of being able thereby to indulge more freely in certain sins, of however trifling a nature. Nor should alms be given except out of property that had been lawfully acquired. When, on the contrary, alms were given out of property unlawfully obtained, the divine justice was thereby rather offended than appeased. Neither might any give alms to the hungry for the purpose of surrendering himself to gluttony and drunkenness; lest perchance, in making the divine justice venal, he might draw down on himself the heavier condemnation. They who so acted or judged, seemed to give their property to God; but beyond a doubt they much rather by their vices gave themselves to the devil.\* This synod denounced also the dangerous, arbitrary, and novel custom, by which men imagined (an error occasioned no doubt by the above-mentioned introduction of *compositions* into the practice of the church), that by the giving of alms they were released from all the other more difficult kinds of church penance—when, on the contrary, the ordinary church penance ought only to be strengthened thereby.† So too the second council of Chalons, A.D. 813,‡ declared against such as expected to purchase immunity from punishment by the giving of alms.§ A false confidence of the same kind was placed also in the mechanical repetition of forms of prayer, of psalms, and even upon those so-called good works which men procured others to do for them. The council of Cloveshove declared, on the contrary,|| that the singing of psalms was without meaning, except as an expression of the feelings of the heart.¶ This council was led to declare itself so strongly and explicitly against these erroneous tendencies, because they had exhibited themselves in the grossest forms. A rich man, who applied for absolution on account of a heavy crime, had stated in his letter, that he had distributed so many alms and procured such a number of persons to sing psalms and to fast

\* Hoc enim modo facientes sive estimantes sua Deo dare videntur, seipso diabolo per flagitia dare non dubitantur.

† Postremo sicuti nova adinventio nunc plurimis periculosa consuetudo est, non eleemosyna porrecta ad minuendam vel ad mutandam satisfactio- nem per jejunium et reliqua expiationis opera, a sacerdote jure canonica indicta, sed magis ad augmentandam emendationem. ¶ C. 36.

§ C. 36. Qui hoc perpetrarunt, videntur Deum mercede conducere, ut sis impune peccare liceat. || C. 37. The intima intentio cordis.

for him, that even if he lived a hundred years longer, he would have furnished a sufficient compensation. If the divine justice could be so propitiated, say the council on the other side, Christ would not have said, How hardly shall a rich man enter into the kingdom of heaven.

In the regulations touching church penance, which belong to the Carolingian period, allusion is constantly made to the fact, that the penance should be measured, not by the length of the time, but by the change of disposition.\* Attention was directed also to the difference between the divine forgiveness of sin and priestly absolution. Alluding to the opinion of those who held that confession of sins before God was alone necessary, and maintaining on the contrary, that both should be united, this council says: We should confess our sins to God, who is the forgiver of all sins according to Psalm xxxi., and mutually pray for each other's salvation. By confession before God, we obtain the forgiveness of sins; by confession to the priest we learn from him the means, by which sin may be purged away. For God, the author and giver of salvation and of health, bestows these blessings, sometimes by the invisible agency of his power, sometimes by employing the agency of the physician.† It is here allowed, that the divine forgiveness of sins could be bestowed, even without the priestly absolution; but that the priest acted only as an instrument of divine grace, for the purpose of leading men to the appropriation of the divine pardon.‡ So too Halitgar

\* Thus the second council of Chalons, 813, c. 34: *n*on*que enim pensanda est p*enitentia* quantitate temporis, sed ardore mentis et mortificatione corporis. Cor autem contritum et humiliatum Deus non spernit.*

† *Confessio itaque, qu*ae* Deo fit, purgat peccata, ea vero, qu*ae* sacerdoti fit, docet, qualiter ipsa purgetur peccata. Deus namque salutis et sanitatis auctor et largitor plerumque hanc p*re*bet su*ae* potentiae invisibili administratione, plerumque medicorum operatione.*

‡ Also Theodulf of Orleans supposes the forgiveness of sins conditioned solely on the inward confession of sins before God, *quia quanto nos memor*es* sumus peccatorum nostrorum, tanto horum Dominus ob*liviscitur*.* But he considers it to be the end of auricular confession, that penitents by following the counsel of the priest, and applying the remedies by him prescribed, and through the mediation of his prayers, might be cleansed from the stain of sin, *quia accepto a sacerdotibus salutari consilio, saluberrimis p*enitentia* observationibus sive mutuis orationibus, peccatorum maculas diluimus, c. 2.* To be sure, according to the church theory of satisfaction, it might be considered necessary, after the for-

says: \* When a man has committed any sin, whereby he is excluded from the body of Christ, a great deal more certainly depends on contrition of heart than on the measure of time; but as no one can look into the heart of another, particular times have been rightly fixed upon by the heads of the church, in order that satisfaction may also be given to the church, in which the sins are forgiven.† It is evident, how much better it would have been for the religious and moral condition of the communities, if there had not been so great a lack of priests capable of administering the system of church penance according to the principles here expressed.

Besides the changes in the system of penance, which proceeded from too lax a tendency, we have still to mention the new and severer kinds of penance, which, although more rarely, were imposed in extraordinary cases, such as murder,— where the delinquent was compelled to go about with a heavy weight of iron chains and rings, made fast to different members of his body; or, thus loaded, to make a pilgrimage to some distant holy place, as the tomb of St. Peter, where, according to the nature of his case, he was to obtain absolution.‡ Against the vagrancy of such penitents, more resembling the spirit of oriental self-castigation than the moral culture of a Christian, and imitated no doubt by enthusiasts and deceivers in other cases besides those described, the emperor Charles finally passed, in the year 789, a special law.§

giveness of sin had been obtained, to obtain also exemption from its punishment by means of church penances voluntarily undertaken, so as to avoid the necessity of being subjected to the fires of purgatory.

\* In his preface de pénitentia utilitate.

† Ut satisfiat etiam ecclesiæ, in qua remittantur peccata.

‡ The description of such an one: Pauperculus quidam presbyter propter homicidii centum circulis ferreis tam in collo quam in utroque constrictus brachio, quam gravibus quotidie suppliciis afficeretur, per sulcos, quos ferrum carnibus ejus inflixerat, videntibus fidem fecit. Vita S. Galli, l. II. c. 34.

§ Nec isti nudi cum ferro (sinantur vagari), qui dicunt se data sibi pénitentia ire vagantes. Melius videtur, ut, si aliquid inconsuetum et capitale crimen commisirint, in loco permaneant laborantes et servientes et pénitentiam agentes secundum quod sibi canonice impossum sit. Baluz. capitular. I. 239.

## SECTION FOURTH.

## HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY, APPREHENDED AND DEVELOPED AS A SYSTEM OF DOCTRINES.

## I. IN THE LATIN CHURCH.

GREGORY the Great, with whom we begin this period, concludes the series of classical church-teachers of the West. By him that form of the development of church doctrine which had obtained in the Christianized Roman world was carried over into the succeeding centuries; and he represents the very important middle point between the Christian creation under the Roman form of culture, now in the process of decline, and the new Christian creation destined to spring forth out of the stock of the German races. Born in Rome, between the years 540 and 550, of a noble, patrician family, he was educated in a style corresponding to his rank, and possessed a good knowledge of Roman literature. Of the Greek language he always remained ignorant. He filled for some time the office of *prætor* at Rome, till, in his fortieth year he retired from active duties and embraced the monastic life. He founded six monasteries; and in one of these, which he had established in the vicinity of Rome, he entered as a monk himself, and was afterwards made its abbot. The Roman bishop, Pelagius II., drew him into the active service of the church, making him one of the seven deacons in the church of Rome. Availing himself of that knowledge of the world and skill in the management of affairs which Gregory had acquired in his former civil capacity, the pope sent him as his agent\* to Constantinople. On the death of Pelagius, in 589, Gregory was chosen his successor. Although he considered it his duty to devote himself with vigilant and unsparring activity to the manifold external business then connected with his official

\* *Ἄποστολος, responsalis.*

station,\* — a course which appeared to him in the light of a necessary condescension of love to the necessities of the weak, after the example of Christ, who for the salvation of men took upon him the form of a servant,† — yet the immediate spiritual duties of his vocation ever seemed to him the most weighty and interesting; and, in fact, he devoted the energies of his mind even to the improvement of the ecclesiastical music,‡ and of the liturgical element in worship generally. He exerted a great influence on the peculiar shaping given to the whole mode of worship in the following centuries. Yet he by no means neglected the appropriate duties of his office as a preacher, but rather accounted them among the most essential duties of the priestly calling §. He held it to be an essential duty of his priestly vocation to admonish and exhort the collective body of the flock in public discourses, and the individual members of the flock by private conversations.¶ He complained that the bishops of his time neglected, by attending so much to outward affairs, the business of preaching, which belonged to their vocation, and, to their own reproach, called themselves bishops without actually performing the duties indicated by this name;¶ and he acknowledged

\* He himself describes the vast amount of foreign business which fell upon his hands, l. I. in Ezechiel, H. XI. s. 6. Cogor namque modo ecclesiarum, modo monasteriorum causas discutere, saepe singulorum vitas actusque spesare, modo quedam civium negotia sustinere, modo de irruentibus Barbarorum gladiis gemere et commissso gregi invidiantes lupos timere, modo rerum curam sumere, ne desint subsidio eis ipsis, quibus disciplinæ re, illa tenetur.

† Nec tedere animum debet, si sensus ejus contemplationi spiritualium semper intentus, aliquando dispensandis rebus mininis quasi minoratus inflectitur, quando illud verbum, per quod constant omnia creata, ut prodesset hominibus, assumta humanitate voluit paulo minus ab angelis minorari, l. XIX. in Job. s. 45.

‡ As late as the beginning of the ninth century the chair was still pointed out on which Gregory was wont to sit when he led the church psalmody of the boys received into the schola cantorum. Joh. Diaconi vita, l. II. c. 1.

§ Praeconis officium suscipit, quisquis ad sacerdotium accedit. Sacerdos vero si prædicationis est nescius, quam clamoris vocem datus est præco mutus? l. I. ep. 25.

¶ Et qui una eademque exhortationis voce non sufficit simul cunctos admonere, debet singulos, in quantum valet, instruere, privatus locationibus sedificare, exhortatione simplici fructum in filiorum suorum cordibus querere. l. I. Hom. XVII. in Evangelia s. 9.

¶ Ad exteriora negotia delapsi sumus, ministerium prædicationis relinquimus et ad pœnam nostram, ut video, ep scopi vocamur, l. c. s. 14.

HIS "PASTORAL RULE."

that in so doing he accused himself, although he was compelled, by the exigencies of the times and in spite of his wishes, to become immersed in these external things.\* Difficult as it often was for him to compose, by reason of his frequent illness and the multitude of affairs of all kinds which claimed and distracted his thoughts, as he himself complains,† yet he was a diligent preacher, and the majority of his writings grew out of sermons which he had delivered. He exerted himself also to stimulate the diligence of others in sermonizing; while it was ever on his lips that, in order to a successful discharge of the preacher's office, life and doctrine must go together. "Words," he said, "that came from a cold heart could never light up in hearers the fervour of heavenly desires; for that which burned not itself could kindle nothing else." † In order to lead the clergy of his times to a sense of the dignity of their office, he drew up for their use a "Pastoral Rule" (*regula pastoralis*), in which a great deal was brought together that lies scattered in different parts of his writings. In this work he endeavoured to show in what temper of mind and in what way the spiritual shepherd should come to his office; how he should live in it; how he should vary his mode of address according to different circumstances, and according to the different character of his hearers; and how he should guard against self-exaltation in perceiving the happy results of his official labours. This work had an important influence, during the next succeeding centuries, in exciting a better spirit among the clergy, and in leading to efforts for improving the condition of the church. The reforming synods under Charlemagne made it their text-book

\* *Me quoque pariter accuso, quamvis Barbarici temporis necessitate compulsus valde in his jaceo invitus.*

† *Quum itaque ad tot et tanta cogitanda scissa ac dilaniata mens duicitur, quando ad semetipsam redeat, ut totam se in prædicatione colligat?* In Ezechiel, l. I. H. XI. s. 6.

‡ *Ad supernum desiderium inflammare auditores suos nequeunt verba, quæ frigido corde proferuntur, neque enim res, quæ in se ipsa non arserit, aliud accedit.* *Moralia, L. l. VIII. in cap. 8 Job. s. 72.* So also l. I. in Ezechiel, H. XI. s. 7. The preacher, he said, could inspire in the hearts of his hearers a love of their heavenly home only *quum lingua ejus ex vita arserit.* *Nam lucerna, quæ in semetipsa non ardet, eam rem, cui supponitur, non accedit.* To this he applies the words of John the Baptist (*J. n. v. 35*): *Lucerna ardens et lucens, ardens videlicet per coeleste desiderium, lucens per verbum.*

in devising measures for the improvement of the spiritual order.\* Very soon after its appearance the question was proposed to the author by a bishop—What was to be done in case that such men as, in this work, were required to fill the offices of the church could nowhere be found?† whether, perhaps, it was not enough to know Jesus Christ and him crucified (*scire Jesum Christum et hunc crucifixum*), where it is quite evident that he who proposed the question was hardly aware how much is implied in *really knowing and understanding* this, according to the sense of St. Paul. With regard to the peculiar theological character, the doctrinal and ethical bent of Gregory upon all this, the study of Augustin, for whom he had a peculiar veneration,‡ had exercised the greatest influence. By him the Augustinian doctrines, in their milder form, and directed rather to the interests of practical Christianity than to those of speculation, were handed over to the succeeding centuries. The practical interest was with him everywhere predominant: it led him to adopt the Augustinian scheme of doctrine only on the side on which it seemed to him peculiarly necessary to receive it in order to the cultivation of a Christian habit of feeling, so as to beget true humility and self-renunciation without leading to the investigation of speculative questions; as, in fact, he was wont to trace heretical tendencies to the circumstance that men had not searched the Scriptures to find that for which they were given to mankind, and which belonged to the discipline necessary for salvation, but, prying after what was hidden and incomprehensible, neglected to apply what was revealed to immediate profit.§ Men boldly speculated on the essence of the divine

\* See the preface to the council of Mentz, 813; the second council of Rheims in the same year. The third council of Tours directs, in its third canon, that no bishop should, if it could possibly be avoided, be ignorant of the canons of the councils, and of the *liber pastoralis*, in *quibus se debet unusquisque quasi in quodam speculo assidue considerare*.

† See lib. II. ep. 54.

‡ A prefect of Africa having solicited a copy of his *Moralia* for his own instruction, Gregory wrote to him, l. X. ep. 38. *Sed si delicioso cupitis pabulo saginari, beati Augustini patriotæ vestri opuscula legitæ et ad comparationem silihinis illius nostrum fursum non queratis.*

§ *Omnes hæretici, dum in sacro eloquio plus secreta Dei student perscrutari, quam capiunt, fame sua sterilem fint. Dum ad hoc tendunt, quod comprehendere nequeunt, ea cognoscere negligunt, ex quibus erudiri potuerunt.*

HIS VIEWS ON PREDESTINATION.

nature, while they remained ignorant of their own wretched selves.\*

Knowledge in God, Gregory contemplated as a causative, creative, and eternal knowledge, whereby the doctrine that predestination is conditioned on a foreknowledge of given events seems by him to be excluded. It is only by a necessary anthropopathism that it is possible to speak of a divine foreknowledge, since the relations of time do not admit of being applied to God, and we can attribute to him properly only an eternal knowledge.† Yet in the application of this maxim he was prevented, by his practical spirit, from extending it to such length as to make the causality of evil revert back on God, though he nowhere enters into any close investigation of this relation. Where it is said that God creates good and evil (Isaiah xlvi. 7), the latter, he says, refers only to the evil which God ordains for good. The creative agency of God cannot be referred ‡ to evil, as being in itself a negative thing.§ Thus, too, he explains the expression, God hardens men's hearts, as meaning simply that he does not, when they have involved themselves in guilt, bestow on them the grace whereby their hearts might be softened.|| By reason of the prevailing notion respecting infant baptism, concerning the origin of which we have spoken already in the preceding period, the question must have occurred to him, Why should one child, if it dies after receiving baptism, be saved, and another, if it dies before receiving the same, be lost? which he answers, rejecting all other modes of explanation, simply by referring to the incomprehensibleness of the divine judgments,

\* Plerumque audacter de natura divinitatis tractant, cum semetipsos miseri nesciant. L. XX. in cap. 30 Job. s. 18.

† Scimus, quia Deo futurum nihil est, ante cuius oculos praeterita nulla sunt, praesentia non transcurrunt, futura non veniunt, quia omne quod nobis fuit et erit, in ejus conspectu praeesto est, et omne quod praesens est, scire potest potius quam prae-scire, quia quae nobis futura sunt videt, quae tamen ipsi semper praesto sunt, praescius dicitur, quamvis nequam futurum praevideat, quod praesens videt, nam et quaeque sunt, non in eternitate ejus ideo videntur, quia sunt, sed ideo sunt, quia videntur. L. 20 in cap. 30 Job. s. 63.

‡ Quae nulla sua natura subsistunt.

§ L. III. in cap. 2 Job. s. 1.

|| See l. XXXI. in cap. 30 Job. s. 26, and in Ezechiel, l. I. H. XI. s. 25.

which men ought humbly to adore.\* In another place,† where he dwells in like manner on the incomprehensible character of God's providential dealings, he makes the following practical application of this truth :—" Let man, then, come to the consciousness of his ignorance, that he may fear.‡ Let him fear, that he may humble himself; let him humble himself, that he may place no confidence in himself. Let him place no confidence in himself, that he may learn to seek help of his Creator; and when he has come to know, that in self-confidence nothing is to be found but death, he may, by appropriating the help of his Creator, attain to life." § With Gregory, the important point touching the relation of free-will to grace is this—that every motion to good proceeds from divine grace; but that the free-will co-operates, while grace works within it in a manner conformed to its nature, following the call of grace with free self-determination; all which, too, may be very easily reconciled with Augustin's doctrine of the *gratia indeclinabilis*; and in this sense alone does he ascribe any merit to free-will.|| By this connection of ideas, Gregory can reconcile with the assertion of a free-will the assertion also of a grace attracting and transforming man's corrupt will with a power which is essentially irresistible. " O, what a consummate artist is that Spirit!" says he. " Without the tardy process of learning, the man is impelled onward to all that this Spirit wills. No sooner does he touch the soul than he teaches, and his touch is itself a teaching; for at one and the same time he enlightens and converts the human heart: it suddenly turns stranger to what it was, and becomes what it was

\* *Quanto obscuritate nequeant conspici, tanto debent humilitate venerari*, l. XXVII. in cap. 36 Job. s. 7.

† See 29 in cap. 38 Job. s. 77.

‡ In reference to the question respecting himself, whether he belonged to the number of the elect, a point about which no person could be certain.

§ *Et qui in se fidens mortuus est, auctoris sui adjutorium appetens vivat.*

|| *Quia præveniente divina gratia in operatione bona, nostrum liberum arbitrium sequitur, nosmetipos liberare dicimus, qui liberanti nos Domino consentimus.* He explains the phraseology of St. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 10) as follows: *Quia enim prævenientem Dei gratiam per liberum arbitrium fuerat subsequutus, apte subiungi git: mecum, ut et divino muneri non esset ingratus, et tamen a merito liberi arbitrii non remaneret extraneus.* L. XXIV. in cap. 33 Job. s. 24.

## UNCERTAINTY ABOUT SALVATION.

not."\* He considers goodness the work of God and man's work at the same time; inasmuch as it is to be traced to the causality of divine grace, while the free-will, as an instrument of the agency of grace, freely surrenders itself, that is, without being conscious of any constraining necessity. Hence we can speak of a reward, although indeed without this determinate agency of grace, which God bestows on none but the elect, this act of the free-will would not have been exerted. And had Gregory been disposed to follow this train of ideas still farther, he must have come to the result that this was a necessary agency of grace, though exerted in the form of the subject's own self-determination.† Now as Gregory made the salvation of the individual depend on the question whether or no he belonged to the number of the elect, and yet, according to his opinion, no man could penetrate into this hidden counsel of the divine mind without a special revelation, it followed that no man, in the present life, can have any certainty with regard to his salvation; and this uncertainty appeared to him a most salutary thing for man, serving to keep him ever humble, and in a watchful care over himself. On one occasion, a lady in waiting, of the emperor's household (cubicularia) at Constantinople, by name Gregoria, wrote to him, that she could have no peace till Gregory could assure her it was revealed to him from God that her sins were forgiven. To this he replied,‡ that she had required of him a thing which was at once difficult and unprofitable—difficult, because he was unworthy of such a revelation; unprofitable, because it was not till the last day of her life, when no more time was left to weep over her sins, she ought to have the assurance that they were forgiven. Till then, distrustful of herself, trembling for herself, she should always fear on account of her sins, and seek to cleanse

\* Gregor. I. II. Hom. in Evangel. XXX. s. 8. O qualis est artifex iste spiritus! Nulla ad discendum mora agitur in omne quod voluerit. Mox ut tetigerit mentem docet solumque tetigisse docuisse est, nam humanum animum subito ut illustrat immutat, abnegat hoc repente quod erat, exhibet repente quod non erat.

† Bonum, quod agimus, et Dei est et nostrum, Dei per prævenientem gratiam, nostrum per obsequenter liberam voluntatem. Quia non immerito gratias agimus, scimus, quod ejus munere prævenimur, et rursum, quia non immerito retributions quæ querimus, scimus, quod obsequente libero arbitrio bona elegimus, quæ ageremus. L. XXXIII. in cap. 41 Job. s. 40. ‡ L. VII. ep. 25.

herself from them by daily tears. This was the state of mind which Paul found himself to be in (1 Cor. ix. 27), notwithstanding he could boast of such high revelations. This mode of viewing the matter, which, in the following centuries, continued to be entertained in the Western church, gave occasion, it is true, to a tormenting species of asceticism, to dark and melancholy views of life, and to various kinds of holiness by works or superstitious observances, which were started into existence by the oppressive feeling of this uncertainty ; but Gregory still directed the anxious soul to trust in the objective promise of divine grace in Christ. Thus, for instance, he concludes one of his sermons : \*—“ Relying on the compassion of our Creator, mindful of his justice, be concerned for your sins ; recollecting his grace, despair not ; the God-man gives man trust in God.”

If we remark, in the doctrinal system of Augustine, two elements—the purely Christian, which proceeded from a profound apprehension of the ideas of “*grace*” and of “*justification*,” as essentially spiritual ideas, and the sensual Catholic, which he had received from the church tradition, and which had become mixed up with the former in his inward life—so too we meet with the same elements in Gregory, and they were transmitted by him down to the succeeding centuries. From the latter proceeded the development of Catholicism in the middle ages, in its sensual Jewish form ; from the former, the seeds of a vital and inward Christianity, which is to be found also under the envelope of Catholicism, and which sometimes even excited and produced a reaction against the sensual Catholic principle. The antagonism between these two elements discovered itself in him in various ways.

Though, on the one hand, he was easily inclined to believe the stories about miracles wrought in his own time, and especially to ascribe such miraculous operations to the sacraments ; and though, by collections of this sort in his Dialogues,† he nourished the passion for miracles in the times which succeeded him ; yet, on the other, his intuitive perception coming

\* In *Evangelia*, I. II. H. XXXIV.

† In which, by the way, several remarkable phenomena are related, belonging to the higher province of psychology, where the energy of a divine life, breaking through mere earthly limits, may perhaps have been revealed.

from the depths of the Christian consciousness of the essence of Christianity, and of the new creation grounded in the redemption, together with the inward miracle of the communication of a divine life,\* led him to appreciate more correctly the external miracle as an isolated and temporal thing, compared to the one and universal fact which was thereby to be introduced and marked, and to form a counter-influence to the fleshy passion for miracles. He considered external miracles as having been once necessary in order to pave the way for the introduction among men of the new creation, to elevate the mind from the visible to the invisible, from the miracle without to the far greater miracle within. They who had something new to announce must procure credence for themselves by these new facts accompanying the new annunciation.† Wherever that highest of all miracles and end of them all, the divine life, has once entered humanity, it no longer needs the external sign. Paul, on an island full of unbelievers, healed the sick by his prayers; but to his sick companion Timothy, he only recommended the natural remedies (1 Tim. v. 23), for the former needed first to be made susceptible for the inward power of the divine life; but the sick friend, who was already sound and healthy within,‡ had no need of the outward miracle.§ The true miracle ever continues to operate in the church, since the church daily accomplishes, after a spiritual manner, such works as the apostles accomplished after a sensible manner—a thought which he finely carries out with reference to the gift of tongues, the gift of healing, &c., spiritually interpreted. And he then goes on to say—"These wonders are the greater, because they are of a spiritual kind; the greater, because by their means not the bodies but the souls of men are revived." "Such wonders," he adds in the ser-

\* Thus, concerning the relation of the diffusion of the Holy Ghost to the incarnation of the Son of God, he says: *In illa Deus in se permanens suscepit hominem, in ista vero homines venientem desuper suscep- runt Deum, in illa Dens naturaliter factus est homo, in ista homines facti sunt per adoptionem Dii.* In *Evangelia*, lib. II. Hom. XXX. s. 9.

† *Ut nova fecerent, qui nova pradicarent. Ad hoc quippe visibilia miracula coruscant, ut corda videntium ad fidem invisibilium pertrahant, ut per hoc, quod mirum foris agitur, hoc quod intus est, longe mirabilius esse sentiatur.* In *Evang. I. I. H.* IV. s. 3.

‡ *Qui salubriter intus vivebant.*

§ Compare also I. XXVII. in cap. 37 Job. s. 36. ed. Benedictin. T. I. f. 869.

mon from which these remarks are taken,\* “you may work, if you will, by the power of God. Those physical miracles are sometimes *evidences* of holiness, but they do not constitute it; but these spiritual miracles which are wrought in the soul, are not *evidence* of the virtue of the life, but they *constitute* that virtue. The former, even the wicked may have (Matt. vii. 22); the latter, none but the good enjoy. Labour not then after miracles, which one may have in common with the reprobate; but after the miracles of love and piety, which are the more sure in proportion as they are the more hidden.” After citing the words of Christ above referred to, Gregory says, in another place,† “It is plain from this, that humility, love, should be honoured in men, not the power of working of miracles. The proof of holiness is not the working of miracles, but the loving all as we do ourselves.” † The gift of brotherly love, he means, is the only token of discipleship as described by Christ himself. He finely unfolds the idea of a *moral* power proceeding from faith, which would get the victory even over the power of Anti-Christ, accompanied though it might be with seeming miracles. §

Though Gregory spoke highly of the operations of divine grace in the miraculous cures effected at the tombs of saints, yet he denounced that direction of prayer at these holy places which sought help chiefly in matters relating to the body. “Behold,” says he, in a sermon preached at the festival of a martyr,|| “how many have come up to the feast, bowing the knee, beating your hearts, uttering words of prayer and confession of sins, moistening your cheeks with tears. But ponder, I beseech you, the character of your prayers, consider whether you pray in the name of Jesus, that is, whether you pray for the joys of eternal bliss; for you seek not Jesus in the dwell-

\* L. II. in Evangel. H. XXIX. s. 3.

† L. XX. in cap. 20 Job. cap. 7. s. 17.

‡ He adds: *De Deo vera, de proximo vero meliora quam de semetipso suntire.*

§ *Ante enim a fidelibus miraculorum divitiae subtrahuntur et tunc contra eos antiquus ille hostis per aperta prodigia ostenditur, ut quo ipse per signa extollitur, eo a fidelibus sine signis robustius laudabiliusque vincatur.* Quorum nimis virtus omnibus signis fit potior, quum omne, quod ab illo terribiliter fieri consicit, per interna constantia calcem premit. L. XXXIV. in Job. c. 3, s. 7.

|| In Evangelia, l. II. Hom. XXVII.

## TREATMENT OF ETHICS.

ing of Jesus, if, in the temple of eternity, you pray in an impatient manner for temporal things. Behold, one seeks in his prayer a wife ; another longs for an estate ; another for clothing ; another for the means of subsistence. And, very true, even for these things, if they be lacking, men must ask the Almighty God ; but in so doing we should ever be mindful of that which we have learned from the precept of our Saviour, ‘Seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you.’ It is no error, then, to pray to Christ even for these things, if we do not seek them *too earnestly*. But he who seeks by prayer the death of an enemy, he who persecutes with prayer one whom he cannot persecute with the sword, incurs the guilt of a murderer ; he fights, while he prays, against the will of his Creator ; *his* very prayer is sin.”

From what has now been said concerning the *doctrinal* principles of Gregory, we may infer the intimate connection in which, in his case as in that of Augustin, the ethical element would stand to the doctrinal, and the peculiar direction his mind would take in the discussion of ethical\* questions. It was the peculiar direction adopted and carried out by Augustin, in opposition to that Pelagianism which severed Christian morality from its intimate connection with the doctrines of faith. It was the tendency which seeks to refer everything back to the central point of the Christian life, the divine principle of a life growing out of faith, the essential temper of love ; and the opposition, thence resulting, to the isolated and outward mode of estimating morality by the standard of quantity. “It is from the root of holiness within,” says Gregory, “from which the single branches of holy conduct must proceed, if that conduct is expected to pass as an acceptable offering, an *oblatio veræ rectitudinis*, before God ;† and the essence of this inward holiness consists in love, which spontaneously gives birth to all that is good. As many branches spring from a single tree and a single root, so many virtues spring from love, which is one. The branch of good works is without verdure, except it abide in connection with the root of love.

\* A subject on which he had particularly employed his thoughts, especially in his *Moralia*, in his practical allegorizing interpretation of Job, which grew out of homilies on this book.

† Lib. XIX. in Job. c. 23, s. 3<sup>o</sup>.

Hence the precepts of our Lord are many, while yet there is but one;—many as it respects the manifoldness of the works, —one in the root, which is love.”\* He, therefore, recognizes the necessary inward connection subsisting between all the virtues, particularly of the so-called cardinal virtues; since one cannot subsist in absolute separation from the rest.† He enters into the following exposition, among others, to illustrate the necessary connection subsisting between the cardinal virtues. *Prudence*, which has respect to the knowledge of what has to be done, can avail nothing without *fortitude*, which supplies the power for the actual performance of that which is known to be right. Such knowledge would be a punishment rather than a virtue. He, then, who by *prudence* knows what he has to do, and by *fortitude* actually does it, is just indeed; but the zeal of justice ceases to be a right zeal, unless it is accompanied with *moderation*.‡ On this principle he combated several individual forms of that fundamental error in morals, of estimating works of piety in a separate and outward manner, *opera operata*; as, for instance, very frequently in the case of almsgiving, in the case of the monastic life, which, in other respects, was so highly valued by him. “It is often observed,” says he, “that individuals, under the urgent feeling of a momentary contrition, become monks; but in changing the outward garb they are not found to be changed also in inward disposition.§ Such persons might be addressed in the language of Paul to those who observed the externals of the law: That with Christ neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but a new creature. To despise the present world; to cease loving the transient and perishable; to be thoroughly humble before God and towards our neighbours; to bear with patience the insults to which we may be exposed, and with patience to banish every feeling of revenge from the heart; not to covet the goods of

\* Lib. II. in Evangelia, H. XXVII. s. 1.

† Una virtus sine aliis aut omnino nulla est aut imperfecta. lib. XXII. Moral. c. 1. l. II. in Ezechiel, H. X. s. 18.

‡ In Ezechiel, lib. I. Hom. III. s. 8.

§ Ad vocem predicationis quasi ex conversione compunctos habitum, non animum mutasse, ita ut religiosas vestem sumerent, sed ante acta vitia non calcarent et de solo exterius habitu, quem sumserunt sanctitatis fiduciam habere.

others, and to communicate of our substance to the needy ; to love our friends in God, and, for the sake of God, to love even our enemies ; to be grieved when our neighbours suffer, and not to rejoice over the death of an enemy ;—this is the new creation.\* So he often speaks slightly of those ascetic ~~s~~usterities which had not grown out of true love and self-renunciation, and which served as a foothold for pride and vanity ;† and of that mock humility which, beneath an appearance of outward self-debasement, concealed the greater pride, making use of the one to nourish the other ;‡ and of the humility that consisted in the opus operatum of confessing one's sinfulness, or particular sin, and betraying, at the same time, the insincerity of this confession, by the manner in which reproofs were received from another.§ Moreover, Gregory transmitted the fundamental principle of the Augustinian ethics, by expounding, in the same strict sense, the obligation to truthfulness, and by utterly condemning every species of falsehood.||

Gregory by no means inculcated a blind faith, excluding all rational investigation ; but on this point also followed the principle of Augustin on the relation of reason to faith, though by virtue of his peculiar bent of mind he ventured less deeply into doctrinal speculations. “The church,” says he, “requires

\* In Ezechiel, 1. I. II. X. s. 9.

† See e. g. 1. II. in Evangelia, IIom. XXXII. Fortasse laboriosum non est homini relinquere sua, sed valde laboriosum est, relinquere semetipsum.

‡ Sunt nonnulli, qui viles videri ab hominibus appetunt atque omne, quod sunt, dejectos se exhibendo contemnunt ; sed tamen apud se intorsus quasi ex ipso merito ostense vilitatis intumescunt et tanto magis in corde elati sunt, quanto amplius in specie elationem premunt. 1. XXVII. Moral. s. 78.

§ Sepe contingit, ut passim se homines iniquos esse fateantur ; sed quum peccata sua veraciter alii arguentibus audiunt, defendant se sum-mopere, atque innocentes videri conantur. Iste de confessione peccati ornari voluit, non humiliari, per accusationem suam humiliis appetit videri, non esse, 1. XXIV. Moral. s. 22.

|| He would not approve of telling a falsehood, even to save life, ut nec vita cuiuslibet per fallaciam defendatur, ne sue animae noceant, dum prestare vitam carni nituntur alienae, quanquam hoc ipsum peccati genus facillime credimus relaxari. Moral. 1. XVIII. s. 5. So also against falsehood springing from a mistaken notion of humility, qui necessitate cogente vera de se bona loquuntur, tanto magis humilitati jungitur, quanto et veritati sociatur. Moral. XXVI. s. 5.

faith only on rational grounds of conviction ; and even when she presents matters which could not be comprehended by reason, she rationally advises that human reason should not be too earnest to fathom what is incomprehensible."\* The influence of Gregory in hastening the decline of the study of ancient literature, has often been greatly exaggerated. In this respect he simply followed out the views which had become predominant in the *Western church*. We remarked on a former page how much he insisted on study as a duty of the clergy ; but we must allow he required such studies of them as were suited to their calling—spiritual studies ;† and he severely reproved a certain bishop, Desiderius of Vienne,‡ because, while a bishop, he gave instruction in grammar, and explained the ancient poets.§ We ought to be exactly informed respecting the motives which influenced the bishop, and of the manner in which he contrived to unite these labours with the duties of his vocation, which, no doubt, under the existing circumstances in France, demanded great attention, to be able to judge how far Gregory was right in passing on him so severe a censure. At all events, we cannot possibly infer, from the fact that he considered this employment unbeseeming a bishop, that he considered the study of ancient literature generally an unsuitable employment for a Christian. But when he says that it is unbecoming even in a pious layman to recite poems that have anything to do with the pagan doctrine of the gods, it would seem to follow from this that he considered it unbecoming a pious Christian to teach the ancient literature. Yet in the vehemence of his feelings towards a bishop who

\* Ecclesia recta, quæ errantibus dicit, non quasi ex auctoritate præcipit, sed ex ratione persuadet. He makes the church say : ea, quæ assero, nequaquam mihi ex auctoritate credita, sed an vera sint, ex ratione pensate. Moral. l. VIII. s. 3.

† The studies of the clergy extended more rarely, however, to the older Greek fathers ; partly on account of their ignorance of the language, partly because the doctrinal opinions of those fathers were less agreeable to the prevailing bent of mind in many. Thus we may explain how it should happen that in the Roman libraries not a single book of the writings of Irenæus was to be found. l. XI. ep. 56.

‡ L. XI. ep. 54.

§ Quia in uno se ore cum Jovis laudibus Christi laudes non capiunt et quam grave nefandumque sit episopis canere, quod nec laico religioso conveniat, ipse considera.

thus employed his time, he may perhaps have expressed himself more strongly than he would otherwise have done.\*

The death of Gregory the Great, in 604, was followed by the political movements and revolutions among\* the nations of the West, amid which the culture transmitted from ancient times was more and more exposed to utter extinction. Although in Rome and Italy† libraries were kept up, from whose stores the new churches in England and Germany were afterwards made fruitful, yet the degree of scientific interest was still insufficient in those countries to make any use of them amid the storms and convulsions by which Italy especially was agitated in the next succeeding centuries. The great interval, in theological cultivation and evangelical knowledge, between

Gregory the Great and the popes of the eighth century, is strikingly apparent. During this wild torrent of destruction Providence was preparing a few places of security in isolated districts, where the remains of the older culture were preserved

\* If the commentary on the books of Kings, which is ascribed to Gregory, might be taken as evidence of his mode of thinking, it would be clear from this that he was much rather a defender of the study of ancient literature in the same sense as Augustin was. He held the study of the liberal arts (artes liberales) to be necessary, in order to learn how to understand rightly the sacred Scriptures. He looks upon it as a device of the evil spirit to dissuade Christians from these studies, *ut et secularia nesciant et ad sublimitatem spirituallium non pertingant.* Moses, in order to be prepared for the right setting forth of divine things, was first instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians. Isaiah was more eloquent than all the other prophets, because he was not, like Jeremiah, an armaturius, but nobiliter instructus. So, too, St. Paul was pre-eminent among the apostles per doctrinam, quia futurus in coelestibus terrena prius studiosus didicit. I. V. in I. Reg. IV. s. 30. At all events, from whomsoever this work may have proceeded, it was a remarkable reaction against the tendency to despise ancient literature. But although this language is too strong to have been used by Gregory himself, yet it is plain from his writings, that while he considered it unbecoming in a Christian to employ his thoughts a long time on many of the works of antiquity, he certainly must have supposed an acquaintance with ancient literature necessary, as a general thing, in order to theological culture—at least if he was consistent with himself. The story about the burning up of the Bibliotheca Palatina, by Gregory's command, cannot be considered as sufficiently attested, the sole foundation for it are the traditions of the twelfth century. John of Salisbury II. 26. Politicrat.

† Where the famous Cassiodorus, after retiring from public life to a cloister, collected together rich treasures of literature: and, by his *institutione divinarum literarum*, inspired the monks with a love of study, and stimulated them to the copying of books.

as materials to be used and appropriated in the new Christian creation among the nations.'

In Spain, at the close of the sixth century and the opening of the seventh, laboured Isidorus, bishop of Hispalis or Seville, who embraced within his knowledge all that in his own age was to be obtained from scientific culture. As a theological writer he exerted some influence by a liturgical work on the duties of ecclesiastics (*De officiis ecclesiasticis libri duo*) ; and by another, which contains, in three books, a collection of thoughts arranged in the order of the more important subjects relating to the doctrines of Christian faith and practice (*sententiarum libri tres*). In this he follows, sometimes word for word, Augustin and Gregory the Great ; and thereby contributed to spread and propagate their principles in the following centuries : as, for example, the doctrines concerning grace and predestination\*—Augustin's stricter principles on the subject of truthfulness.† In his Chronicle of the Goths, also, he disapproves the violent measures resorted to for the conversion of the Jews in Spain, and follows the principles of Gregory.‡ The seeds of scientific and theological culture scattered by Isidorus long continued to operate in Spain, even after the conquest of this country by the Saracens in the eighth century ; and the separation of Spain from its connection with the rest of the Christian world, may have been the very reason why many things were more freely developed there now than at an earlier period, the clergy being no longer so cramped and restricted by the system of the Romish church. Hence the signs of the reaction of a freer spirit against the traditional Roman tendency (see above, p. 207).

We said, on a former page, that the monasteries of Ireland became asylums and centres for collecting the elements of

\* The form of expression deserves notice, 1. II. c. 6. *Gemina est prædestinatio sive electorum ad requiem sive reproborum ad mortem.*

† L. II. c. 30. *Hoc quoque mendacii genus perfecti viri summopere fugiunt, ut nec vita cuiuslibet per eorum fallaciam defendatur, ne suæ animæ noceant, dum præstare vitam alienæ carni nituntur, quamquam hoc ipsum peccati genus facilime credimus relaxari.*

‡ He says, concerning such measures of king Sisabut: *Æmulationem quidem Dei habuit, sed non secundum scientiam. Potestate enim compulit, quos provocare fidei ratione oportuit.* He then, to be sure, adds: *Sed sicut scriptum est Phil. i., sive per occasionem sive per veritatem, Christus adnuntiatur, in hoc gaudeo et gaudebo.*

theological and learned culture. Far renowned were the masters from Scotland (magistri e Scotia), who travelled not only to England but to France and Germany, and taught various branches of knowledge. From Ireland, as we have seen, England was enriched with books and science; and the enthusiasm which was first excited in that country led English clergymen and monks to procure books from Rome and Gaul.\*

In the seventh century Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury, and the abbot Hadrian, who had accompanied him from Rome, gained for themselves deserved credit by their efforts to further the progress of culture in England. They traversed the country in company with each other, and made arrangements for the establishment of schools. They left behind them many disciples; and among these, as Bede reports,† were men able to speak Latin and Greek as their mother tongue. Under these influences grew up a man who deserves to be called emphatically the teacher of England, the Venerable Bede. Born in the year 673 in the village of Yarrow in Northumberland, he received his education, from the time he was seven years old, in the monastery of Wearmouth, and this monastery was also, until his death, the seat of his great, though unobtrusive, activity as a teacher. By him many other church-teachers, who became eminent also as instructors in other countries, were educated. Of himself he says,‡ that he had bestowed every pains upon the study of the Scriptures, and amid the devotional exercises and liturgical duties which devolved on him as a monk and priest, it had been his delight to be ever learning, teaching, or writing.§ The manner of his death corresponded with such a life, consecrated in noiseless activity to God. In the last fourteen days of it he calmly and cheerfully contemplated his approaching departure, sur-

\* In the account of the life of the abbot, and afterwards bishop, Aldhelm, composed by William of Malmesbury, who wrote, it is true, in the twelfth century, but made use of earlier sources, it is mentioned that the merchant vessels from France often brought with the rest of their merchandise, bibles and other books. See cap. 3. *Acta Sanctorum Bolland. mens. Maj. T. VI. f. 82.* † *Hist. Eccles. iv. 2.*

‡ In the report on his life and writings, in his history of the English church; also *Acta S. Maj. T. VI. f. 721*, and Mabillon, *Acta S. ord. Benedicti sec. III. P. I.*

§ *Semper aut discere, aut docere, aut scribere dulce habui.*

wounded by his disciples, thankful for all the good he had received in this life, and even for his final sufferings, which he looked upon as a means of sanctification.\* His last hours were consecrated to the work of his life—the instruction of youth; and he died in the midst of his beloved pupils on the 26th of May, A.D. 735.†

In the spirit of Bede, the same work was carried forward by Egbert, one of his scholars and particular friends, who super-

\* His scholar Cuthbert says of him: *Vere fateor, quia neminem inquam oculis meis vidi nec auribus audivi tam diligenter gratias Deo vivo referre.*

† In those last fourteen days of his sickness he was employed in translating the Gospel of John into the Anglo-Saxon tongue, and in correcting the collection of Isidore's Abbreviations for the benefit of his scholars; "For," said he, "my scholars ought not to read a false text, and *after* my death labour to no purpose." When his disease grew more violent, and it was only with difficulty he could breathe, he still continued to teach during the whole day; and on the day before his death, he cheerfully dictated to his amanuensis, and remarked to one of his scholars, "Make haste to learn; I know not how long I shall still remain with you, and whether my Creator may not soon take me to himself." Thus he employed the last days of his life in dictating to his scholars, in correcting what they had written, and in answering their questions. Having thus occupied himself till after the third hour past noon, he begged one of his scholars to summon quickly the priests of the convent. "The rich of this world" said he, "can make presents of gold, and silver, and other precious things; these I have not, but with much love and joy will I give my brethren what God has given me." It was a little pepper, frankincense, and some articles of church apparel. When they arrived, he begged each of them to read the mass diligently, and pray for him. "It is time," said he, "if it so please my Maker, that I should return back to him who created me from nothing. I have lived long—the time of my dissolution approaches; I long to depart and to be with Christ, for my soul earnestly desires to see my king Christ in his beauty." These and like things he said till it was evening; then one of his scholars, whom he had given something to write, begged him to make haste and finish it, came and told him he had but one sentence to write. "Write it quickly, then," said he. Soon afterwards the young man reported—"The sentence is now finished." "Yea," answered Bede, "thou hast spoken rightly—it is finished. Take my head in thy hands, for it is a great joy to me to sit over against the consecrated spots where I have been wont to pray, in order that I may quietly call upon my Father." Thus supported by his scholar, on whose hands he had laid his head, he kneeled down on the floor of his cell and sang the words of the doxology—"Gloria Patri et Filio et Spiritui Sancto;" and, with the last words of praise to the Holy Spirit, he breathed out his life on earth.

intended a school at York, where instruction was given in all the then existing branches of knowledge, and where especially the study of the bible, and of the writings of ancient church-teachers that served to expound them, were diligently pursued; and even after Egbert became archbishop of York, he still devoted much time to the direction of this school, which he placed under the immediate care of his disciple Albert.\* From this school proceeded Alcuin, the great teacher of his times; born in York, the very same year in which the eminent master, whose place he was to fill in a still wider field of action, the Venerable Bede departed from this life. He afterwards became head of the school in York which was so flourishing under his direction, and many from distant places were here his scholars, until the emperor Charles invited him to join in the great work of educating the Franks, and of improving the condition of the Frankish church.

The Frankish church, under Charlemagne, was the central point which united all the scattered rays of culture from England, Ireland, Spain and Italy; and Charles took advantage of every opportunity to stimulate the bishops of his kingdom to diligence and zeal in promoting learned studies, setting them an example by his own personal exertions. Having, for example, received letters from the abbots and bishops, in which they stated their petitions to him, he was pained to observe the extreme deficiency they manifested in an ability to express their thoughts with correctness and propriety. This led him to issue a circular letter,† in which he exhorted them to the zealous pursuit of scientific studies, as a means which would enable them better and more easily to understand also the mysteries of Holy writ.‡ He considered

\* His scholar Alcuin, who always clung to him with great affection, said of him in his poem on the archbishops and holy men of York,

*Qui Christus amor, potus cibus, omnia Christus,  
Vita, fides, sensus, spes, lux, gloria, virtus*

and

*Indolis cœgregat juvenes quoscunque videbat,  
Hos sibi conjunxit, docuit, nutritvit, amavit*

† Bouquet collectio scriptorum rerum Franc T. V. f. 621. Concilia Galliarum, T. II. f. 621.

‡ Quum autem in sacris paginae schemata, tropi et cætera his similia inserta inveniantur, nulli dubium est, quod ea unusquisque legens tanto

it of great importance that the heads of the churches should co-operate for the same object with the learned men whom he had assembled around him;\* and among these, Alcuin was beyond doubt the most distinguished. When, in the year 780, the latter was on his return from a mission to Rome which had been entrusted to him by the archbishop of York, and the emperor, who had been acquainted with him before, met him at Parma, he pressingly invited him to remain with him, for the purpose of taking the direction of the institutions which he was about to establish. Having returned to his native land, and obtained permission from his king and from his archbishop to comply with this request, he fulfilled the wish of the monarch. The latter granted him a monastery near the city of Troyes, and the monastery of Ferrieres in the diocese of Sens, that he might direct the studies of the monks, and be provided for by the revenues of these establishments. But he placed under his particular charge the institution of learning which he himself had established, for youth of the higher ranks, in the vicinity of his own palace (the schola Palatina). Here he came into immediate contact with the emperor, and the most eminent men in the state and church, and was invited to give his advice on all affairs pertaining to the church, and to the education of the people. He instructed the emperor himself, and the latter called him his most beloved teacher in Christ.† He often proposed to him questions on difficult passages of Scripture, on the meaning of liturgical forms, on church chronology and other theological topics, which had been started in the conversations at the court of the emperor Charles. When absent from his residence, the emperor until his death kept up a familiar correspondence with him, in which Alcuin was accustomed to express his opinions with great freedom.‡

citius spiritualiter intelligit, quanto prius in literarum magisterio plenius instructas fuerit.

\* The discordia inter sapientes et doctores ecclesiae, he held to be the worst thing that could happen, as he wrote to the monks of the convent of St. Martin of Tours, by occasion of a quarrel between Alcuin and Theodulf bishop of Orleans. Among Alcuin's letters, ep. 119.

† Carissime in Christo p̄eceptor, he calls him in a letter from which Alcuin quotes a few lines in his answer, ep. 124.

‡ As a monument of Alcuin's devout and Christian temper of mind, the consoling words which, in the year 800, he wrote to the emperor on

We remarked on a former page, how important it was regarded by the emperor, both in relation to his own wants and those of the church, that the text in the Bible, in the then current Latin translation, which through the negligence and ignorance of transcribers had in many cases become wholly unintelligible, should be corrected; and this weighty task he imposed on Alcuin.\* In the beginning of the year 801, wishing to congratulate the king on his accession to the imperial throne, Alcuin sent him, as a present, a copy of the entire Bible carefully corrected throughout by his own hand.†

Having spent eight years in this circle of labours, Alcuin returned once more to his native country, where he resided about two years, and then, somewhere near the year 792, came back and resumed his former occupation. At the approach of old age, however, he was desirous of withdrawing from the bustle of court, and from the multiplied concerns in which he here found himself involved, to renounce all employments whatsoever, except those immediately connected with religion, and retiring from the world, to be allowed to prepare in quiet for his departure from the present life, to which everything else should be subordinated.‡

the death of his wife, Liodgarde, may stand here: *Domine Jesu, spes nostra, salus nostra, consolatio nostra, qui clementia tua voce omnibus sub pondere enjuslibet laboris gementibus mandatis: velite ad me omnes, qui laboratis et onerati estis, et ego respondeo vos.* Quid hac promissione jucundius? *Quid hac spe beatius?* *Et ad eum omnis anima merrens, omne cor contritum, fundens lacrimas in conspectu misericordie illius, neque abscondat vulnera suo medico, qui ait: ego occidam et vivere faciam, pereuntiam et ego sanabo, Deut. xxxii. 39.* *Flagellat miris modis, ut erudit filios, pro quorum salute unico non pepercit filio.* He then represents the Son of God saying to the soul: *Propter te descendit et patiebar, quia legisti n<sup>o</sup> litteris meis, ut tibi præpararem mansionem in domo patris mei.* *Regnum meum tantum valet, quantum tu es.* *Te ipsam da et habebis illud, ep. 90.*

\* As he himself says: *Domini regis preceptum in emendatione veteris novique testamenti; see the letter prefixed to the sixth book of his Commentary on the Gospel of St. John, T. I. Vol. II. f. 591. ed. Froben.*

† *Alcuin, ep. 103.* He had long been thinking what to send him. *Tandem spiritu sancto inspirante inveni, quod meo nomine competenter offerre et quid vestra prudentia aptibile esse potuisset.*

‡ See ep. 168. *Seculi occupationibus depositis soli Deo vacare desidero. Dum omni homini necesse est vigili cura se præparare ad occursum Domini Dei sui, quanto magis senioribus, qui sunt annis et infirmitatibus contracti.*

If the ancient account of Alcuin's life is to be credited,\* it was his wish to find a resting-place for the evening of his life in the monastery of Fulda. But when the emperor had concluded to release him from immediate service, he still wished to employ his abilities, though in the tranquillity of retirement, in the work to which they had thus far been consecrated. The abbey of St. Martin at Tours having been left vacant in the year 796, he resolved on employing Alcuin to restore among the monks of that convent the discipline which had begun to decline, and also to found here a flourishing school. In this spot Alcuin continued to labour as a teacher, with the same activity and zeal as he had shown before, though under different circumstances.† But when urged by his increasing infirmities, and the presentiment of approaching death, to seek a release from all external business, he obtained permission to commit during the last years of his life, the direction of the convent under his care to chosen scholars of his own.‡ Thus, as he said,§ he could quietly live in the abbey of St. Martin, waiting for the summons to depart.|| The wish which, in the last years of his life, and under the sense of its approaching end, he had been used to express, that he might die on the festival of Pentecost, was fulfilled on the 19th of May, 804.

There was during this period too little scientific life in the Western church, to give occasion for the starting up of opposite views of doctrines and of controversies arising therefrom.

\* Which may be found in the first volume of Frobenius' edition, in the *Actis Sanctorum*, at the 19th of May; *Mens. Maj. T. IV.*; and in *Mabillon, Acta S. O. B.*

† He speaks of this in his thirty-eighth letter to king Charles. He says here that he instructed some in the exposition of Scripture, others in ancient literature, others in grammar, others in astronomy, plurima plurimis factus, ut plurimos ad profectum sanctarum ecclesiarum et ad decorum imperialis regni vestri erudiam, ne sit vacua Dei in me gratia nec vestrae bonitatis largitio inanis. But he complains of the want of books, and begs permission of the emperor to send some of his scholars to England to procure books from that quarter.

‡ Ep. 176, to the archbishop Arno, ut scias, quanta misericordia mecum a Deo omnipotenti peracta est, nam rebus omnibus, quae habui per loca diversa, adjutores mihi ex meis propriis filiis elegi adiuvante per omnia suggestionibus meis Domino meo David, as he was in the habit of calling the emperor Charles.

§ Ep. 175.

|| Spectans, quando vox veniat: aperi pulsanti, sequere jubentem, exaudi judicantem.

Even in the Carolingian age, in the epoch formed out of the whole period in which learning flourished most, men were far more busily occupied in firmly establishing and practically applying what had been handed down by tradition, than in entering into any new investigations of the doctrines of faith. Yet, naturally, it was in this epoch alone that oppositions of doctrine could busy the Western church of this period. But it is singular to observe, that it was in the Spanish church of all others—a church which, though not oppressed, was yet under the rule of a foreign race that professed the religion of Mohammed, in no very favourable situation for progress in science—a revival commenced of the old opposition between the Antiochian and the Alexandrian schools ; though we must admit that in the Spanish church, owing to this very fact of its peculiar situation, such an opposition would have room for more freely unfolding itself, than would have been possible under other circumstances. In order to trace with certainty the origin of such a dogmatic tendency in the Spanish church of those times, we need more distinct information respecting the manner in which the controversy about to be mentioned began, and of the internal relations of the church itself. In this regard, it is an important question, which of the two principal persons, whom we see standing up as the defenders of the new system, Eliandus, archbishop of Toledo, or Felix, bishop of Urgellis,\* is to be considered as the real author of this revived Antiochian tendency.

Eliandus, if we may judge from those writings of his which still remain, was a violent, excitable man, governed by the impulses of a blind zeal,† who had diligently studied, it is

\* La Seu d'Urgelle, in the dukedom of Cerdanya, in Spain.

† So he appears also, in the first doctrinal controversy in which he publicly engaged. In his disputes with Migitius, a Spanish false teacher, Eliandus had occasion, it is true, to draw more sharply the line of distinction between the humanity and deity of Christ; and here, no doubt, he already made use of expressions which might give occasion to his being charged with Nestorianism : for example, in the letter to Migitius, s. 7 : *Persona filii, qua facta est ex semine David secundum carnem et ea, qua genita est a Deo patre.* Indeed, as a general thing, he was extremely awkward and unskilled in the use of doctrinal terms ; but in this polemical writing no other marks of Adoptianism are as yet to be found. He here employs the term *assumptio*, not *adoptio*. It would throw light on the subject had we the means of investigating the doctrines of this Migitius with a view to determine the precise relation of

true, the ancient fathers, but was wholly wanting in the spirit of scientific research. We can easily believe him on his own testimony, that if once led by some accidental cause to make use of a doctrinal phrase, which should afterwards be attacked so as to make him feel personally injured, by those whose relative position in the church entitled him, as he supposed, to expect from them submission to his archiepiscopal authority, he would only be the more tenacious of the ex-

Elipandus to him, and to his system; but we must despair of arriving at any satisfactory result in this way, unless some new sources of information should still be opened in Spain. As the isolated and scattered accounts of Migetius are of no importance, the only valuable source still continues to be the letter of Elipandus to this Migetius, published by Florez in the *Espana Sagrada*, T. V. Ed. II. Madrid. 1763, p. 524. But Elipandus writes here with too much passion, he indulges too freely in the practice of making his own inferences; he shows too little capacity of entering into another's mode of thinking, to make it possible for us to form from his contrary statements and positions anything like a clear notion of Migetius's doctrines. So far as we can derive any hints from this letter, indicating the real opinions of Migetius, it would seem that he was inclined to Sabellian views. His opinion was, that the Logos first became *personal* with the assumption of Christ's humanity—that the Logos was the power constituting the personality in Christ; hence he was accused of asserting: *quod ea si secunda in Trinitate persona, quae facta est ex semine David secundum carnem et non ea quae genita est a patre*; but that the Holy Ghost first assumed a personality in the apostle Paul; in him appeared the Spirit promised by Christ, which was to proceed from the Father and from the Son. At any rate, it were greatly to be wished that we knew what the views were which Migetius entertained with regard to the relation of St. Paul to the more complete development of Christianity, and which, though they may have been misrepresented, were yet the occasion of his being accused of holding the opinions just described. In the next place, he was charged with maintaining that priests should be perfect saints: *Cur se pronuntient peccatores, si vere sancti sunt?* aut si certe se peccatores esse fatentur, quare ad ministerium accedere præsumunt, *eo quod ipse dominus dicat: Estote sancti, quia et ego sanctus sum Dominus Deus vester*. But here also the question comes up, in what sense did he say this? Did he mean perfect freedom from sin? Next is laid to his charge a declaration which, if he made it, would certainly go far to show that he was wrapped in a strangely fanatical conceit of his own holiness. He said, for instance, that it was not lawful for him to eat with unbelievers (Saraceus), or to partake of food which had been touched by them. Compared with him, on this particular side, Elipandus appears as the representative of the true Christian spirit; for the latter appeals to the words of St. Paul, that to the pure all things are pure; to the fact that Christ ate with publicans and sinners; and to the declaration of St. Paul that it is permitted to accept an invitation to a feast even from an unbeliever.

passion which, in this conflict of opinions, would gain an importance in his eyes wholly disproportionate to its value. Now the term "adoption," which is sometimes found employed, even in the older fathers, to denote Christ's assumption of human nature into unity with the divine, was often introduced in the Gothic-Spanish liturgy\* then in use;† and to such passages Elipandus not unfrequently refers.‡ We might, therefore, suppose that Elipandus had been led by such expressions to speak of an "adoption" of humanity by Christ in order to sonship with God, and to call him, with reference to his humanity, the adopted Son of God (*Filius Dei adoptus*); and that he would zealously defend this doctrinal phrase, when it came to be attacked, as if it were a phrase of peculiar importance. With Felix of Urgellis, however, the case stood somewhat differently. In him we may perceive a radical and thorough doctrinal tendency, which is not to be traced to any such outward and accidental cause. The more probable view is, then, that the doctrine concerning Christ's person designated by the name "Adoptionism," proceeded originally from Felix, by whom we find it presented in a strictly coherent system, rather than from Elipandus, a man hardly calculated to be the author and founder of any peculiar type of doctrine.§ It would indeed be a very singular affair for an octogenarian like him to provoke, at so advanced a period of life, a ~~controversy~~ on this point. The truth is, too much stress seems to have been laid generally upon the individual doctrinal phrases "adoption" and "adopted Son," which gave its name to this whole type of doctrine; just as in the Nestorian controversies an undue importance was given to the single expression *Geotokos*. As we shall see, when we come to examine this

\* The officium Mozarabicum. † *Adoptio* == *assumptio*, *ἀνάληψις*.

‡ The expressions in the Toledoan liturgy, *Adoptivi hominis passio* *adoptio carnis, gratia adoptionis*. Elipandi epistola ad Alcuinum, T. I. P. II. f. 872. ed. Froben.

§ The conflicting historical testimonies on a matter of this sort, so far out of the range of common observation, can settle nothing on this point. It would not follow as a matter of course that the individual who first brought this subject into public discussion was the first to develop this type of doctrine. And even though Elipandus might have been the first to use some such expressions as those mentioned in his controversial writings, it would, by no means, prove him to have been the author of this dogmatic tendency.

type of doctrine with reference to its internal coherence as a system, it could have subsisted independently of this particular expression, and of the comparison which it occasioned, of a son according to the flesh with a son by adoption. And it is possible, though not susceptible of proof, that the liturgy just mentioned may have led the author of the scheme to hit upon this particular comparison, while yet we should by no means be authorized, on such a ground as this, to derive from the liturgy this whole peculiar scheme of doctrine, which is itself, in fact, presupposed thereby.

In remarking the very striking agreement between the views of Felix on this subject, as they were gradually unfolded, and those of the Antiochian Theodore, we might be led to conjecture, that the former had received his first impulse in that peculiar direction from studying the writings of this father; and as there had been considerable intercourse in former times between the Spanish and the African churches; as the dispute concerning the three chapters had led to a translation of the writings of Theodore into Latin, for the use of the African church-teachers, while that controversy was pending; it is quite possible, that these writings, in such translations, may have been circulated in Spain. Still, however, we are not warranted by the few fragments of Felix which remain, to form any certain conclusion with regard to the nature of this agreement, which, indeed, may have resulted, independent of such outward derivation, from a resemblance of intellectual character between the two men, and in the circumstances of opposition under which they developed themselves.

If it be true, that Felix had been employed in defending Christianity against the objections brought against it from the standing-point of Mohammedanism, and in proving the divinity and truth of Christianity for the use of Mohammedans,\* which he might naturally be led to do by the vicinity of the latter, and by his own close connection with the Spanish bishops; the first impulse to the formation of that peculiar type of doctrine might easily be traced to this circumstance. In an apologetic effort of this kind, it would be unnecessary for him to prove the divine origin of Christianity generally, or the divine mission of Jesus; for these he could assume as already

\* The emperor Charles had heard that Felix had written a *disputationem cum sacerdote*; yet this was unknown to Alcuin. See Alcuin, ep. 85.

acknowledged in the doctrine of the Koran. But what he had to prove was, the doctrine of the incarnation of God, and of the deity of Christ, against which and the doctrine of the Trinity the fiercest attacks of the Mohammedans were directed ; and by his apologetic efforts in this direction, he may have been led to seek after some such way of presenting this doctrine, as to remove, wherever possible, that which proved the stone of stumbling to those of the Mohammedan persuasion. Thus we might explain the origin of the Adoptionist type of doctrine, respecting the internal coherence of which, as a system, we shall now proceed to speak.

Felix, like Theodore of Mopsuestia, was opposed to the indiscriminate interchange of predicates belonging to the two natures in Christ. When the same predicates were applied to Christ, in reference to his deity and in reference to his humanity, he required that it should always be precisely defined in what different sense it was done ; particularly in what different senses Christ is called Son of God, and God, according to his deity and according to his humanity. He insisted here on the distinction, that when Christ is called by these names in reference to his deity, that is designated which has its ground in the divine essence ; and when so called in reference to his humanity, that is designated which came from an act of free-will, a particular decree of God—the antithesis of *natura, genere*, on the one side, and of *voluntatis, beatitudinis, placito*, on the other. As in the former reference, Christ is in essence God and Son of God ; so in the second reference, he is God and Son of God, inasmuch as he was taken into union with him, who is in essence Son of God. Now over against the notions *essential* and *natural*, stands that also which can be so designated only in another sense, by a sort of metonymy (nuncupative). Unless it was meant to be said that Christ derived his humanity from the essence of God himself, no other course remained, according to Felix, but to make *this* antithesis. In the same sense, he now introduced the antithesis also between a son by birth and nature (*filiis genere et natura*), and a son by adoption (*adoptione filius*). The notion of adoption, he supposed, stands for nothing else than precisely that filial relation which is grounded, not in natural descent, but in a free act of the father's will. And hence, to those who objected that the title of "Son by adop-

tion" is nowhere attributed to our Saviour in the Scriptures, he replied, that still the fundamental idea was in strict conformity with Scripture; since other determinate conceptions, of like import, were actually to be found in Scripture.\* All these determinate conceptions are closely connected; and without them the conception of Christ's human nature, as one not derived from the divine essence, but created by the divine will,† could in nowise be retained. He who denies one of these determinate conceptions, must therefore deny also the true humanity of Christ.‡ But the term "adoption" seemed to him peculiarly appropriate, as a designative term, for this reason, namely, that it was plain, from a comparison with human relations, that one person could not have two fathers by way of natural origin, though he might have one father by natural origin, and another by adoption;§ and in like manner Christ could, in his humanity, be son of David by natural derivation, and by adoption Son of God. He searched the Scriptures for all those predicates which denote a relation of dependence in Christ, for the purpose of proving the necessity of that distinction, as one presupposed in the Scriptures themselves. When the form of a servant is attributed to Christ, the name servant had reference, not merely to the voluntary obedience rendered by him as man, but also to the natural relation, in which he, as man, as a creature, stood to God; in antithesis to the relation in which he stood to the Father, as Son of God, by his nature and essence as the Logos. This opposition he designated by the phrase *servus*.

\* *Si adoptionis nomen in Christo secundum carnem claro apertoque sermone in utroque testamento, ut vos contenditis, reperire nequimus, cætera tamen omnia, quæ adoptionis verbo conveniunt, in divinis libris perspicue atque manifeste multis modis reperiuntur. Nam quid quæ est cuilibet filio adoptio, nisi electio, nisi gratia, nisi voluntas, nisi adsumptio, nisi susceptio, nisi placitum seu applicatio?* Si quis vero in Christi humanitate adoptionis gratiam negare vult, simul cuncta, quæ dicta sunt, cum eadem adoptione in eo negare studeat. Alcuin. contra Felicem, l. III. c. 8, T. I. opp. 816.

† *Humanitas in qua extrinsecus factus est, non de substantia patris subsistens, sed ex carne matris et natus est.* l. VI. 843.

‡ *Rationis veritate convictus velit, solit negaturus est eum verum hominem.* l. III. c. 2, f. 817.

§ *Neque enim fieri potest, ut unus filius naturaliter duos patres habere possit, unum tamen per naturam, alium autem per adoptionem prorsus potest.* l. III. f. 812.

FEELIX'S APPEAL TO HOLY WRIT.

conditionalis, servus secundum conditionem.\* Nowhere, he affirmed, is it asserted in the gospel, that the Son of God—~~but~~ always and only, that the son of man was given up for us.† He adduces the fact, that Christ himself, Luke xviii. 19, said of his humanity, that it was not good of itself, but God in it, as everywhere else, was the original fountain of goodness.‡ He alleges, furthermore, that Peter says of Christ, Acts x. 38, God was in him; Paul, 2 Cor. v. 19, God was in Christ—not as though the deity of Christ were for this reason to be denied, but only that the distinction of the human from the divine nature should be firmly held § He maintained, that by this mode of designating the purely human element in Christ, the Son of God, as Redeemer, is glorified;

\* Namquid qui verus est Deus fieri potest, ut conditione servus Dei sit, sicut Christus Dominus in formā scīti, qui multis multisque documentis, non trutum propter obedientiū in ut plerique volunt, sed etiam et per naturam servus patris et filius ancillū eūs verissime adocetur, I VI. f 840 But here his opponents could not admit the distinction between the *propter obedientiū et per naturam* since they derived the latter from the former, referred the assumption of human nature by the Son of God to his self renunciation and applied to this Philipp. ii. 8, 9 Furthermore illum propter inobligationem beatitudinis, qui se incallit Dei humili vocē pī testatur servum esse conditionalum, f 839 Where the manner in which he speaks of the Virgin Mary may have given offence, in the prevailing tendency of the times

† L c 831, 53. Here Alcibiades brings against him several passages of the New Testament John iii. 16 Rom. viii. 32, Ephes. v. 2; Acts iii. 13, 14, 15 But Felix was led into his error by following exclusively, with regard to the name Son of God, the usage loquendi of the church, instead of going back to that of the Scriptures

‡ Ipse, qui esset aliter cum patre et spiritu sancto solus est bonus, est Deus, ipse in homine licet sit bonus in naturam naturaliter a semetipso est bonus I V f 837 Hence indeed, if we may judge from his language, Felix seems to have fallen into a self contradiction. This arose from his confounding together two different points of view, that derived from his own peculiar notions and that taken from the doctrinal standing-ground of the church. By his own peculiar notions he was, strictly speaking, not led to an *avtriusbiorum, tam ovozatav*, but he was so, no doubt, by adhering to the prevailing doctrinal terminology of the church, and he now sought to render this transfer of predicates harmless, by adding explanations according to his own theory of distinction. Proceeding in a consistent manner, on his own principle, he ought rather to have said The human nature, taken into union with him who is, in his essence, Son of God, and in his essence good, is in its essence not good

§ Non quod Christus homo videlicet assumptus, Deus non sit sed quia non natura, sed gratia atque in incarnatione sit Deus V. 832.

since he assumed all this only out of compassion for, and to secure the salvation of mankind. In order faithfully and fully to represent the doctrine of holy Scripture, we should alike place together that which marks his humiliation and his exaltation.\* Felix himself, however, could not enter, with an unprejudiced mind into the views of the New Testament writers. While his opponents were disposed to torture and force them wholly into the form of their own theory of the mutual interchange of predicates, or as it was afterwards called, the communication of idioms, Felix, on the other hand, allowed himself to twist the Scriptural view into accommodation with his theory of distinction, which he would everywhere force upon the sacred writers; as, for example, when he says that, in the words of Peter, Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God,—the predicate *Christ* has reference to the humanity in which he was anointed, the predicate *Son of the living God*, to his deity.† Felix agreed with Theodore, also, in comparing the manner in which the humanity of Christ was taken into fellowship with the deity, with the manner in which believers attain, through him, to union with God. Adoption, the reception into union with God, by the grace of God, by virtue of a special act of the divine will, according to the divine good pleasure, he defined as being, in this case, the same in kind; without meaning, for this reason, to suppose that what he considered to be the same in kind only in a relative sense—especially as opposed to that which is grounded in, and derived immediately from, the divine essence—was absolutely identical. On the contrary he affirmed, that notwithstanding this relative sameness in kind, everything was to be conceived, in the case of Christ, after a far higher manner (*multo excellentius*);—and he here supposes, no doubt, not a merely gradual, but a specific difference; as may be gathered from the fact, that he by no means represents the human nature of Christ as appearing first in its self-subsistence, and then entering into union with the deity; but on the contrary, he started with supposing, that the true and essential Son of God assumed humanity into union with himself,

\* *Sicut ea, quae de illo celsa atque gloriosa sunt, credimus et collaudamus, ita humilitatem ejus et omnia indigna, quae propter nos misericorditer suspicere voluit, despicere nullo modo debemus.* l. III. f. 818.

† L. V. f. 832.

## ADOPTION OF MEN BY GRACE.

from the moment of its conception ; that the human nature ever unfolded itself in this unity, though conformably with its own laws ; that no separate being for itself was to be ascribed to it ; but that its existence, from the first, developed itself in that union with the divine Logos, into which the human nature had been assumed from its creation. He adduces the words of Christ himself, John x. 35, to prove, that he placed himself in a certain respect in one and the same class with those on whom, by virtue of that fellowship with God in which they stood by divine grace, the divine name had been conferred.\* So there existed between him and all the elect the truest communion, in this respect also, that he shared along with them a divine nature and divine names (though these belonged to him in a pre-eminent sense) ; even as he shared with them all other things, predestination, election, grace, the form of a servant.† Accordingly he could now say, the same person, who in the unity of the divine essence is the true God, becomes, in the form of humanity, by the grace of adoption, which was to pass from him to all the elect, partaker of the divine essence, and is therefore called God ; or the Son of God became, without change of his divine nature, son of man ; inasmuch as he vouchsafed to unite the man, from his origin, into personal unity with himself,—and the son of man is Son of God, not in the sense that the human nature was changed into the divine, but in the sense that the son of man *in the Son of God* (by virtue of this assumption of the former into union with the latter) is true Son of God. ‡

\* Qui non natura, ut Deus, sed per Dei gratiam ab eo, qui verus est Deus, deificati dū sunt sub illo vocati.

† In hoc quippe ordine Dei filius dominus et redemptor noster juxta humanitatem, sicut in natura, ita et in nomine, quamvis excellentius canetis electis, verissime tamen cum illis communicat, sicut et in ceteris omnibus, id est in prædestinatione, in electione, gratia, in adsumptione nominis servi. IV. 820.

‡ Ut idem, qui essentialiter cum patre et spiritu sancto in unitate Deitatis verus est Deus, ipse in forma humanitatis cum electis suis per adoptionis gratianū deificatus fieret et nuncupative Deus, and in the other passage, at the beginning of the fifth book, which is more strictly allied to the church form of doctrine : qui illum sibi ex utero matris scilicet ab ipso conceptu in singularitate sua persone ita sibi univit atque conservavit, ut Dei filius esset hominis filius, non mutabilitate naturæ, sed dignatione, similiter et hominis filius esset Dei filius ; non versatilitate substantiae, sed in Dei filio esset verus filius.

But like Theodore, Felix too felt constrained to controvert such propositions, stated without restriction or limitation, as that Mary is the Mother of God.\* Felix, again, like Theodore, compared the baptism of Christ with the baptism of believers, and places both in connection with the spiritual birth by adoption (*spiritualis generatio per adoptionem*). This certainly he could not so have understood as if baptism were related in altogether the same manner to the adoption of Christ as to the adoption of believers, for in fact he supposes the adoption which relates to the humanity of Christ to have begun with the creation of that humanity. He probably meant, therefore, simply to say, that the sign of this adoption began to be revealed in an outward manner, from Christ's baptism onward, by the divine powers bestowed on him as the Son of God after his humanity. Probably, like Theodore, he supposed a revelation of the divine power manifesting itself in the form of Christ's humanity, and following, step by step, the course of the development of his human nature; and hence he probably supposed also that the resurrection of Christ was the completion of this revelation, which began first in the form of the supernatural, with the baptism.† In conformity with this theory of the revelation of deity under the forms of human nature, Felix also defended Agnoetism, and cited in its favour, Mark xiii. 32.‡

From this exhibition of the Adoptianist doctrine we may easily understand how its opponents would see in it, as judged from the platform of the ordinary church-system of doctrines, a sort of revived Nestorianism—a lowering down of the doctrine of Christ's divinity. It was, so far as it concerned the dogmatic interest, a similar contest to that between the Antiochian and the Alexandrian schools in the earlier centuries; on one

\* Though he perhaps did not venture to combat this expression which was now generally adopted, yet he called upon the other party to produce his authorities for such a position as this *quod ex utero matris verus Deus sit conceptus et verus sit filius Dei.* VII. 857.

† L. II. c. Felicem, f. 909. *Accepit has geminas generationes, primam videlicet, quae secundum carnem est, secundam vero spiritalem, quae per adoptionem fit.* Idem *redemptor noster secundum hominem complexas in se continet, primam videlicet, quam suscepit ex virgine nascendo, secundam vero, quam initavit in lavacro (et consummavit) a mortuis resurgendo.* Without the parenthetic clause the words give no sense.

‡ See l. V. f. 835.

side, the interest in behalf of the rational, on the other, the interest in behalf of the supernatural mode of apprehending Christianity; on one side, the interest to give prominence to that which in the person of Christ answers to the analogy of human nature, on the other, the interest to seize on those points in the character of Christ which prove his exaltation above human nature.\*

Two ecclesiastics in Spain first stood forth openly in opposition to this Adoptianistic system, Beatus, a priest in the province of Labana, and Etherius, a bishop of Othma. According to the representations of the other side, Beatus must have been a man of notoriously bad morals; but the credibility of this accusation becomes suspicious when we consider the passionate temper of his opponents.† Another charge appears more worthy of credence, which represents Beatus as bearing the character of a false prophet (pseudo-propheta). He employed himself a good deal on the exposition of the Apocalypse. The situation of the Spanish church, under the rule of a Saracenic Mohammedan race,‡ was well calculated to excite expectations of extraordinary divine judgments, to direct the imaginations of men towards the future, and to the indulgence of the most extravagant prospects. Accordingly, Beatus seems

\* When Felix threw out the question: *Quid potuit ex ancilla nasci nisi servus?* Alcuin replied: *Hujus nativitatis magis est argumentum quam omnium creaturarum conditio.* Concede Deum aliquid posse, quod humana non valeat infirmitas comprehendere, nec nostra nesciacione legem ponamus majestati aeternae, quid possit, dum omnia potest, qui omnipotens est. l. III. c. 3. Aleuin c. Felic.

† This charge might appear more credible, it is true, from the consideration that Elipand seems to appeal to a fact; viz., that Beatus was deposed from his spiritual office for immorality; as he says in his letter to Alcuin: *Antiphrasius* (that is, the *αντίφραστος*, such was the epithet commonly applied to him by his opponents). *Antiphrasius Beatus, anti-christi discipulus, carnis immunditia futilis et ab altario Dei extraneus*; also in the letter of the Spanish bishops to the emperor Charlemagne, he is called *carnis flagitio subiunatus*: but it would be necessary to know more exactly how the case really stood with this deposition before we could draw from it any certain conclusion.

‡ It is plain, from the letter of Elipandus, that the Spanish Christians must have felt themselves oppressed. He says, near the conclusion of his letter to Alcuin (Alcuin. opp. ed. Froben. T. I. P. II. f. 870), *oppressione gentis afflicti non possumus tibi rescribere cuncta; and in his letter to Felix (l. c. f. 916), quotidiana dispendia, quibus duramus potius quam vivimus.*

to have predicted that Christ's coming to judge unbelievers was near at hand, and to have gone so far as to fix the precise time at which he would appear.\* The controversy in Spain was conducted with great acrimony on both sides; each denouncing the other as unworthy the name of Christian. Elipandus pronounced his antagonists heretics and servants of Anti-Christ, who ought to be exterminated.† To him it appeared an unheard of thing, that a provincial priest of Libana should take it upon him to instruct the church at Toledo that time-honoured seat of the pure doctrine of tradition.‡ He brought up against his antagonists his own authority as the first bishop of the Spanish church, and seems moreover to have gained the secular power over to his side.§ Not only the theologians and clergy, but the churches were divided by these disputed points.|| As neither party was able to separate its own peculiar notions from the essential thing of Christian faith in the Redeemer, each side, as Beatus expressed it, contended with the other for the one Christ, though their common cause against a common enemy, Mohammedanism, should have served to call forth, and keep in livelier action, the sense of their Christian fellowship in the fundamentals of faith. The controversy spread beyond the boundaries of Spain into the adjacent provinces of France. Felix, bishop of Urgellis, being the most distinguished representative and champion of Adoptionism, it followed, as a matter of course, that the Frankish empire must be brought to participate in this dispute. Both the friends and enemies

\* Thus, in the letter of the Spanish bishops (Alcuin. opp. T. II. f. 573), it is said he had predicted the world would come to an end on a certain day, which he had fixed; and the people were thus led with excited expectations to pass the time from the night of Easter Sabbath to the third hour of the afternoon of Easter Sunday in fasting.

† Elipandus writes: *Qui non fuerit confessus Iesum Christum adoptivum humanitatem et nequaquam adoptivum divinitatem et haereticus est et exterminetur.* See the fragment in the work of Beatus against Elipandus lib. I. in the *Lectiones antiquæ* of Canis. ed. Basnage T. II. f. 310.

‡ Non me interrogant, sed docere querunt, quia servi sunt antichristi.

§ Beatus says (l. c. f. 301): *Et episcopus metropolitanus et princeps terræ pari certamine scismata haeticorum unus verbi gladio, alter virga regiminis ulciscens.* If a Saracenic prince was here meant, it would be a remarkable proof that the opinions of Adoptionism were the most acceptable to the Mohammedans; yet it is possible the reference was to a West-Gothic monarch, if we can only suppose that, in the then political state of Spain, such a monarch was to be found in that country.

|| *Duo populi dñæ ecclesiæ*, says Beatus, l. c.

of Felix agree in representing him as a man distinguished for his piety and Christian zeal. The fragments of his writings which we possess evince his superiority not only to Elipandus, but to all his antagonists, in acuteness of intellect. Eminent above all other theological writers of this age, for the calm and unimpassioned manner in which he stated his opinions, the only great defect to be observed in his character as an author is, the frequent obscurity of his style, which was owing perhaps in part to the particular form of the Latin language, as then cultivated in Spain.\*

The spread of this controversy into the Frankish provinces, led the emperor Charles to cause the matter to be investigated by an assembly convened at Regensburg in the year 792, before which Felix himself was summoned to appear. His doctrines were here condemned, and he himself consented to a recantation. The emperor thereupon sent him to Rome; a procedure which may be easily explained, partly from the emperor's undeniable respect for the Romish church, without whose aid and counsel he was unwilling to take a step in any affair of moment, and partly from his want of confidence in the sincerity of Felix. At Rome, it was hardly to be expected that the explanations which had been thus far made by Felix, would give complete satisfaction. He was arrested and confined; and, while in prison, was induced to prepare a new written recantation. Of course, these recantations of Felix did not proceed from any change that had really taken place in his mode of thinking, a thing which could not possibly be so brought about. On his return home, he repented having denied his own convictions of the truth, and betook himself to those parts of Spain which were under the Saracenic dominion, where he could once more express his convictions with freedom. Upon this, the Spanish bishops issued two letters, addressed to the emperor and to the Frankish bishops—the latter a polemical writing, which entered fully into the defence of Adoptianism; and they proposed both a new examination and the restoration of Felix to his former place. These letters the emperor sent to pope Hadrian; but without awaiting his decision, the emperor caused the matter to be brought before the council of Frankfort on the Main, in the year 794. The decision of this

\* Yet the incorrectness of the copy of the declarations of Felix, which has come down to us, is also to be taken into account.

council, as might be expected, went against Adoptianism ; and the emperor now sent the transactions of the synod, together with a letter certifying his own approval of them, to Elipandus, and the other Spanish bishops.

When the Frankish church first became enlisted in these controversies, Alcuin was absent in England ; but having in the meantime returned to Frankfort, as he held the first place among the theologians of the Frankish church, the emperor Charles was especially anxious to employ his influence for the suppression of Adoptianism. At first, Alcuin availed himself of the acquaintance which he had formed with Felix at some earlier period,\* and wrote him a letter breathing all the spirit of Christian love. He begged him not to destroy by this one word so much that was good and true in his writings, and thus bring to nought the efforts of a life spent from his youth upwards in works of piety. To the party of Felix, he opposed the authority of the entire church. The controversy, he said, was, in truth, about a single word, a superficial judgment, we must allow, and refuted by the conduct of Alcuin himself in laying so much stress upon the difference. As he had requested Felix, in this letter to try to draw off Elipandus from his error, so he wrote to the latter a friendly and respectful epistle, in which he intreated him to use his influence on Felix for the same purpose. Next, he composed a treatise against the doctrine of Adoptianism, which he addressed to the clergy and monks in the French provinces bordering on Spain,† and which was designed to fortify them against the influence of the erroneous opinions coming from that quarter ; but Felix did not feel himself touched in the least by those passages from the older fathers which Alcuin had quoted against him, and in a work from his own pen, defended himself at length, and endeavoured to prove the correctness of his doctrines. Alcuin, in his letter, had opposed to the small party of the Adoptianists the uniform agreement of the whole church, which led Felix to unfold in this work his own idea of the church ; and on this point, we may assuredly discover in him a very liberal tendency, widely departing from the system of the Romish church. “ We believe and confess,” said he, “ a holy Catholic church, which, diffused through the whole world by the preach-

\* See his short letter to Felix, expressing esteem and love for him and asking for an interest in his prayers.

† In Gothia.

ing of the Apostles, is founded on our Lord Christ, as on an immovable rock (therefore not on Peter)\*—but the church may also, sometimes, consist of few.”† Elipandus, at a subsequent time, answered Alcuin in a letter filled with violence and bitterness. He upbraids him on the score of his wealth, stating that he owned twenty thousand slaves.‡ In opposition to the authority attached to universality, Elipandus said: Where two or three are assembled together in the name of Christ, there Christ is, as he promised, § in the midst of them. The broad way, in which the multitude go, was a way leading to destruction; but the narrow way, which but few travel,

\* *In Christo Domino velut solida petra fundatam.*

† *Aliquando vero ecclesia in exiguis est.* See c. Felicem, l. I. See 791, 92.

‡ As it regards the first, Alcuin, in his letter to the three spiritual delegates of the emperor, says, on the other hand (opp. T. I. P. II. p. 860), In the holding of worldly goods, everything depends on the temper of the heart, quo animo quis habeat seculum, aliud est habere seculum, aliud est haberi a seculo. Est qui habet divitias et non habet, est qui non habet et habet. As regards the second: hominem vero ad meum nunquam comparavi servitum, sed magis devota caritate omnibus Christi Dei mei famulis servire desiderans.

§ In accordance with this, are also the declarations of Elipandus, in the above cited letter to Migeius. In opposition to the extravagant titles which the latter seems to have bestowed on the Roman church, Elipandus says (l. c. p. 534): *Hec omnia amens ille spiritus te ita intelligere docuit. Nos vero e contrario non de sola Roma dominum Petro dixisse credimus: Tu es Petrus, scilicet fit nitas fidei, et super hanc petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam, sed de universalis ecclesia catholica, per universam orbem in pace diffusa.* He demands of him, how it could be reconciled with the assertion, that the Roman church was the ecclesia sine macula et ruga, that the Roman bishop Liberius had been condemned along with heretics? It must no doubt have been the case, too, that Elipandus was on many points far superior to the popes of these times in Christian freedom of spirit. In the letter already cited, Elipandus earnestly contends, that nothing barely external, nothing that comes from without, can defile the man. But to pope Hadrian such principles appeared offensive. In Rome, at this period, the apostolical decree, *Acts x.v.*, the barely temporary significance of which was recognized in Augustin's time, was held to be of perpetual validity.—The delegates of the pope had to dispute with persons in Spain who maintained, in the sense of Elipandus, that, qui non ederit pecudum aut suillum sanguinem et sifocatum rudis est aut ineruditus. But the pope pronounced the anathema on those who maintained this, see *Espana Sagrada*, T. V. l. c. p. 514. He also declared against those who, following likewise the principles of Elipandus, believed there was nothing defiling in holding intercourse and eating with Jews and Saracens.

was the one that led to everlasting life. God had chosen not the rich, but the poor.\* As the work of Felix against Alcuin had, in the meantime, been sent to the emperor Charles, the latter called upon Alcuin to refute it: but Alcuin begged that so important a matter should not be devolved on him alone, but that the work of Felix should also be sent to the pope, to Paulinus patriarch of Aquileia, to Theodore bishop of Orleans, and to Richbon bishop of Triers. All these should engage in the refutation of it. If they agreed in their arguments, this would be evidence of the truth; if not, that should stand valid which most fully accorded with the testimonies of Holy Scripture and of the ancient fathers.† *Thus it appears that he, too, was not for allowing the pope an absolute power of decision in matters of faith.* The emperor adopted this plan. He caused the work of Alcuin, in refutation of Felix,‡ to be read in his presence, to which he listened with such critical care as to mark what seemed to him to be capable of improvement, and to have it in his power to send Alcuin a list of passages which in his own view needed correction.§ And inasmuch as Adoptianism had found its way among many of the clergy, monks, and laity in the Frankish provinces bordering on Spain, the emperor considered it necessary to send a clerical committee to those parts for the purpose of counteracting it. For this business he chose Benedict abbot of Aniana in Languedoc, Leidrad archbishop of Lyons, and Nefrid bishop of Narbonne. These prelates succeeded in obtaining a conference with Felix himself in the town of Urgell. They here promised him, that if he would come into the Frankish kingdom they would not proceed against him with violence, but that a calm investigation should be made of the whole subject in dispute on rational grounds. Confiding in this promise, he appeared before a synod at Aix, in the year 799, in the presence of the emperor himself. The promise was sacredly observed, and here the abbot Alcuin

\* We certainly recognize in such expressions the archbishop of an oppressed church. † See ep. 69.

‡ His seven books against Felix, which, as they contain many fragments from the works of Felix himself, are the most important source of information on the subject of his doctrines.

§ Ep. 85 to the emperor. *Gratias agimus, quod libellum auribus sapientiae vestre recitari fecistis et quod notari jussistis errata illius et remisistis ad corrigendum.*

## AGNOETISM OF FELIX.

disputed with him for a long time. At length he declared himself to be convinced; and Alcuin supposed that, through divine grace and by the authorities of the ancient fathers arrayed against him, a true conviction had been wrought in his mind.\* At the same time, however, he betrays a shade of suspicion with regard to the sincerity of Felix.† In his work against Elipandus, he testifies his joy, in the spirit of Christian love, over the supposed conversion of Felix. The manner in which the truly devout and gentle Alcuin received and conversed with Felix at Aix no doubt made a deep impression on the latter, and he afterwards testifies his love towards him ‡. But although, perhaps, the imposing character of the assembly and the exposing of some dangerous consequences to which his expressions might lead, produced on him a momentary impression, and forced him to yield, yet it is by no means probable in itself, that the man, who, in theological dialectics, excelled his opponents, could have been induced by a *single* disputation, to alter that mode of apprehending doctrines which was so deeply rooted in the very constitution of his mind. As his sincerity or his firmness was not fully trusted, he was not permitted to return to his bishopric, but was placed under the oversight of Leidrad archbishop of Lyons. He drew up himself a form of recantation for the benefit of his former adherents, in which, rejecting the phrase “Adoption,” he still endeavoured to hold clearly apart the predicates of the two natures. The delegates already mentioned were afterwards sent for a second time, in the year 800, to visit those districts, where, according to Alcuin’s report,§ they laboured with success, having induced ten thousand persons to recant. Felix lived in Lyons till the year 816; and it is clear, from reliable evidence, that he continued to retain unaltered his type of doctrine concerning the person of Christ, with which Agnoetism was closely connected. He endeavoured to bring those who conversed with him to concede, that the knowledge of our Saviour, while on earth, so

\* Ep. 76. *Divina clementia visitante cor illius novissime falsa opinione se seductum confessus est.*

† *Nos vero cordis illius secreta nescientes occultorum judici causam dimisimus.*

‡ Alcuin, ep. 92. *Multum amat me totumque odium, quod habuit in me, versum est in caritatis dulcedinem.*

§ See ep. 92.

## CHRISTIANITY IN THE GREEK CHURCH.

far as concerned his humanity, was not, judging from his own professions with regard to himself, absolutely unlimited. Agobard, who succeeded Leidrad as archbishop of Lyons, having heard of such remarks by Felix, asked him if he really thought thus. Felix replied in the affirmative; but when Agobard placed before him a collection of the sayings of the older fathers, directly opposed to this view, he promised to take all possible pains to arrive at a better knowledge\*—words, however, which still implied that he was not yet ready to adopt a different opinion; and the probability is, that he merely sought to get rid of a dispute. Besides, a card of his was found, after his death, written over with questions and answers, in which the theory of distinction maintained by Adoptionism was clearly asserted.†

## II. IN THE GREEK CHURCH.

IN the Greek church, the cultivation of letters had been preserved to a far greater extent than in the Latin; though all true intellectual progress had long since been suppressed by a political and spiritual despotism. There was the want of a living, self-moving, creative spirit, to animate the inert mass of collected materials. In interpreting the sacred writings, the chief object was, to bring together the expositions of the older fathers, and arrange them in the order of the several books of the Bible,—out of which collections afterwards arose the so-called Catenæ (*σειραι*) on the Holy Scriptures. The Monophysite controversies had at length contributed in a special manner to awaken the dialectic spirit, which derived fresh nourishment from the study of the Aristotelian philosophy, and fresh practice from the prolonged controversies with the Monophysites. The same causes tended to promote an abstract dialectical method of expounding the doctrines of faith, which was employed chiefly on the doctrine of the Trinity, and the doctrine of the two natures in Christ, less attention being paid to the practical element in the system of faith. An undue stress was laid on a formal orthodoxy, to

\* Promisit se omnis emendationis diligentiam sibimet adhibiturnum.

† See the tract composed by Agobard, on this account, against the doctrines of Felix—the last in this controversy.

the neglect of practical Christianity ; and beside the former an external holiness of works, or a piety consisting in the observance of outward forms, or bound up with and upheld by superstition, could peacefully proceed. This dialectical tendency, which, seizing upon the results of the doctrinal controversies, elaborated and arranged them, produced, in the eighth century, the most important doctrinal text-book of the Greek church, which was entitled, "*An accurate summary of the orthodox faith,*" (*ιεροβιβλιον ἔκδοσις τῆς ὁρθοδόξου πίστεως,*) drawn up near the beginning of that century by the monk John of Damascus ; where the expositions of doctrine are given for the most part in the expressions of the older fathers, especially the three great teachers from Cappadocia. Nevertheless, in the Greek church, the original and free development of spiritual life was too scanty to allow any such important creation to start forth here out of the union of the ecclesiastical and dialectical tendencies, as deserves to be compared with the scholastic theology of the Western church.

Monasticism had ever continued in the Greek church to maintain an important influence ; an influence, ~~too, which~~ in kind differed entirely from that which prevailed in the Western church of this period ; for the predominant contemplative tendency had still been preserved in it, and hence the Greek monasteries were the favourite seats of a mystical theology. At these places, the writings which, as we remarked in the history of the preceding period, were forged under the name of Dionysius the Areopagite, had an unbounded influence. It is remarkable, that the spread of these writings was due in the first place to opponents of the dominant church, and that while they were in the hands of these men, the church was familiar with the arguments against their genuineness. The Severians (a party of the Monophysites) at a conference with theologians of the Catholic church held at Constantinople in 533, adduced, among other things, testimonies from these writings in favour of their opinions. But their opponents refused to admit such testimonies as genuine, alleging that, as these writings were wholly unknown to the ancients ; as neither Cyril in the controversy with Nestorius, nor Athanasius in the controversies with Arius, had made any use of them, it was sufficiently evident, that they could

not be so old as was pretended.\* A certain presbyter, Theodorus, composed, in the seventh century, a work in defense of the genuineness of these Dionysian writings;† and from what is known to us respecting the contents of that work, it is clear that the genuineness of those writings was impugned on right grounds. The arguments against them were four—1. That none of the later church-teachers cited them. 2. That Eusebius, in his catalogue of the writings of the older fathers, makes no mention of them. 3. That they are filled with comments on church traditions which had arisen only by degrees, and had been progressively shaping themselves into form, during a long period of time, in which they had received many additions. 4. That in them were cited the letters of Ignatius, though he lived after Dionysius. Nevertheless, the spirit of historical criticism was too little prevalent in this period, and the force of that symbolizing, mystical, and contemplative bent of mind was too potent to allow any chance of victory to arguments based on grounds of criticism. Now by means of these writings, the elements of New-Platonism, and in part of the older Alexandrian theology, were transferred into the later Greek church; and as, in earlier times, there had been formed, out of the same elements, a certain religious Idealism which spiritualized rigid Judaism and the sensual rites of Pagan religions, so the recurrence of a like phenomenon might be expected in the Greek church.

A theology which had sunk into this spiritualizing mode of interpretation could adopt the whole round of superstitious notions connected with the worship of saints and of images, and by this spiritualization place them on a firmer basis; while the people, who were profoundly ignorant of this contemplative theology, would apprehend the whole in the grossest material form. By distinguishing two different positions, a mode of apprehension by symbols and another which stripped away everything symbolical, and soared to the intuition of pure ideas; by distinguishing a humanizing and a de-

\* See the Acta of the Collatio Constantinopolitana of the year 538, Harduin. Concil. II. 1163.

† The notice of its contents, where we have only to regret that Photius has not cited what Theodore said in refutation of the weighty arguments, is to be found in Photius, Bibliotheca, p. 1.

humanizing, a positive and a negative mode of apprehension (α θεολογία καταφατική and ἀποφατική);\* a way was contrived for blending with that idealism the whole system of church ordinances and customs. Furthermore, the excessive use of these writings led to a fulsome style of language, easily inclining to exaggeration, which marred the simplicity of the gospel. From the same cause arose also a singular combination of dialectical and mystical theology, whereby the dogmatism of the understanding became permeated by a certain element of religious intuition and of the fervour of the feelings. We may consider as a representative of this dialectical, contemplative tendency, the monk Maximus, in the seventh century, a man distinguished for acuteness and profundity of intellect. He had filled an important station at the imperial court, as the emperor's first secretary,† and was in the way of attaining to still higher posts, but partly for the purpose of holding fast his convictions amid the Monotheletic controversies, he retired to the seclusion of the monastic life, and finally became an abbot. It is evident from his works, that the writings of Gregory of Nyssa and of the Pseudo-Dionysius had exerted a very considerable influence on his mode of thinking in theology. The grand features of a coherent system may be discovered in them, together with many fruitful and pregnant ideas, which, if he had developed himself and acted his part under more favourable circumstances, might have been the means of leading himself and others to an original construction of the Christian system of faith and morals. He was also distinguished for his zeal in endeavouring to promote a vital, practical Christianity, flowing out of the disposition of the heart,‡ in opposition to a dead faith and outward works. The solid inward worth and importance of this individual

\* As this distinction had been already used by Philo; see Vol. I.

† Πρώτος ἵπογχαρις τῶν βασιλικῶν ἵτανημάτων.

‡ To the authorities of the Greek fathers against slavery, let us here add that of Maximus. He regarded slavery as a dissolution, introduced by sin, of the original unity of human nature, as a denial of the original dignity of man's nature, created after the image of God,—while it was the aim of Christianity to restore the original relation. He says of slavery: ἡ τῆς αὐτῆς δηλονότι παρὰ γένεται διάτριπτος φύσις, ἀπέκρινεται τὸν κατὰ φύσιν ὁμότιμον, τόμον ταῖς οὐρανοῖς ἰχεύει, τὴν τυραννεῖσαν τὴν τύχον ἀγέλεια τῶν διστομένων διάτοιν. Exposit. in orat. Dom. I. f. 356.

induces us to dwell the longer upon his peculiarities, and to give the fuller exposition of the ideas which lie at the centre of his theology.

Christianity, as it seemed to him, forms the exact mean betwixt the too narrow apprehension of the idea of God in Judaism, and the too broad one of the deification of nature in paganism; and this mean is expressed by the doctrine of the Trinity.\* The highest end of the whole creation he supposed to be the intimate union into which God<sup>1</sup> entered with it through Christ; when, without detriment to his immutability, he assumed human nature into personal union for the purpose of rendering humanity godlike; God becoming man without change of his own essence, and receiving human nature into union with himself without its losing aught that belongs to its peculiar essence. It was with a view to secure this point that he attached so much importance also to the articles touching the union of the two natures, in which each retains, without change, its own peculiar properties.† The end and purpose of the redemption was not solely to cleanse human nature from sin, but to elevate it to a higher stage than it could attain by its original powers—to raise it up to an unchangeable, divine life.‡ Hence the history of creation falls into two grand divisions—the preparation for that assumption of human nature by the Divine Being, and the deification of human nature progressively unfolding itself out of this fact in all such as become susceptible of it, by the bent of their will, even to the attainment of perfect blessedness.§ Accordingly, he often speaks of a continual incarnation of the Logos in believers, in so far as the human life is taken up into union with Christ and permeated by the principle of his divine life; || and he considers the soul of the

\* The antithesis of the διαστολή and the συστολή τῆς θιότητος, on one side, the καταμερίζειν τὴν μίαν ἀρχήν, on the other, the μία ἀρχή, but στενή καὶ μεταληπτή. See the exposition of the Paternoster. Maximi opera ed. Combebis. T. I. f. 355.

† Quest. in scripturam, pp. 45 and 209. Θιοῦ ἀφράστως ὑπεράγακος βουλή, to the fulfilment of which all else is but preparatory; ἀγρίστως ἵγκραστης τῇ φύσει τῶν ἀνθρώπων διὰ τῆς καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἀληθοῦς ἵνασεις, ιαυτῇ διὰ τὴν φύσιν ἀναλλοιώτως ἵνασαι τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην.

‡ Τῇ θιάσισι πλιονικτοῦσα τὴν πρότην διάπλασιν. Quest. in script. f. 157.

§ L. c. p. 45.

‘Ο χριστὸς διὰ τῶν συζητούσιν σημειώμενος.

## NATURAL ABILITY AND GRACE.

individual who thus begets a divine life out of himself as a *Sōteros*.\* As the Logos, being God, was the creator of the woman, whom, from love to mankind, he caused to become his mother—so far as it concerned his bodily generation as a man, —so the Logos in us, is in the first place the creator of faith, and then a son of the faith that is in us, embodying himself, by the virtues that spring out of faith, in Christian action.† Now, as human nature was so formed by God as to be the organ of a divine life exceeding the limits of the finite creation, as to be capable of receiving a higher principle, and of being permeated thereby, though without exceeding the limits of the peculiar essence given to it by creation, a way was provided in this theory for establishing a harmonious connection between creation and redemption, nature and grace, the natural and the supernatural, reason and revelation; and the scattered hints pointing at this connection we may consider as the luminous points of his system. “The faculty of seeking after the godlike ‡ has been implanted in human nature by its Creator, but it is first enabled to arrive at the revelation of the godlike by the supervening power of the Holy Spirit. But as this original faculty has, in consequence of sin, become suppressed by the predominance of sense, the grace of the Holy Spirit must supervene for the purpose of restoring this faculty to its pristine freedom and purity. We cannot properly say that grace, by itself alone, and independent of the natural faculty of knowledge, communicates to the righteous the knowledge of mysteries;§ for in that case we must suppose that the prophets understood nothing at all of what was revealed to them by the Holy Spirit. A little can we suppose that they attained to true knowledge by seeking for it with the natural faculty alone, for thus we should make all supervention of the Holy Spirit superfluous. When St. Paul says, The one and the self-same Spirit, which worketh in all, divideth to every man severally as he will, this is to be understood to mean that the Holy Spirit wills that which is suited to each individual, so as to guide the spiritual striving of those

\* Exposition of the Paternoster, p. 354.

† Καὶ τὴν πρᾶξιν ταῖς ἀριτμίαις σωματούμενος.

‡ Αἱ ζητητικαὶ καὶ ἰστινητικαὶ τῶν Θείων δύναμις.

§ Χάρις τῶν τῆς γνῶσεως δικτικῶν κατὰ φύσιν δυναμίων.

who are seeking after the godlike to its desired end.\* Accordingly, the Holy Spirit works not wisdom in the saints, without a mind which is susceptible of it; it works not knowledge, without the recipient faculty of reason; it works not faith, without a rational conviction respecting the future and the invisible; † it works not the gift of miraculous healing, without a natural philanthropy; and, in a word, it produces no charisma whatsoever, without the recipient faculty for each. ‡ The grace of the Spirit destroys not in the least the natural faculty, but much rather makes that faculty, which has become inapt by unnatural use, once more efficient, by employing it conformably to its nature, when it leads it to the contemplation of the godlike.” §

So, in like manner, the union of the divine and human natures in Christ corresponds to the mutual adaptation to each other of the divine and human elements in believers. “As the Logos could not have wrought the natural works of the body after a manner worthy of God, without a body animated by a rational soul, so neither could the Holy Spirit produce the knowledge of the mysteries, without a faculty seeking after knowledge in the way of nature.”|| All Christian contemplation and action are so brought about in believers that God works within them as his instruments, ¶ and the man contributes nothing thereto but a disposition that wills what is good. \*\* In conformity with this relation of the natural to the supernatural, of revelation to the recipiency of man, which is the condition of it, Maximus supposes a progressive development of the divine revelations, according to the point attained by the individuals to be educated. Hence in the Old Testament, the revelation and agency of God was connected with forms of sense, for the purpose of elevating man from

\* Βούλιται τὸ ἱκανοῦ δηλονότι σύμφερον εἰς πληροφορίαν τῆς ἀπαύγουσαν ταῦτα πειρατεύονταν τὰ Διάτα τρίσιων.

† Αὐτὸν τῆς κατὰ νοῦν καὶ λόγου τῶν μελλόντων καὶ πᾶσι τίσι ἀδίλων πληροφορίας.

‡ Χωρὶς τῆς ἱκανοῦ δικτικῆς ἔξεως τε καὶ δυνάμεως.

§ Ἡ χάρις οὐδαμῶς τῆς φύσις καταργεῖ τὴν δύναμιν, ἀλλα μᾶλλον καταργεῖσσαν πάλιν τὴν χρήσιν τῶν πρὸς φύσιν πρότων ἐνεργῶν ἴστοι πάλιν τὴν χρήσιν τῶν κατὰ φύσιν πρὸς τὴν τῶν Διάτων κατανόησιν εἰσάγουσα.

|| See Quest. in script. 59 T. I. p. 199, and what follows.

¶ Πλάσαντες ἐν ἡμῖν ὡς ἀργάνους ὁ Θεός ἐπιτελεῖ πρᾶξην καὶ θιαρίαν.

\*\* Πλὴν τῆς δειλούσης τὰ καλὰ διαδίσιως. Quest. in script. 54, p. 152.

sensible things to spiritual.\* As he proceeds upon the idea of a communion with the divine source of life imparting itself to man, which man is enabled to appropriate by means of the organ originally implanted in his nature, and now once more unfolded to freedom, so he apprehends the idea of faith as the internal fact of this appropriation. But it is from faith that this divine life must first unfold itself — from faith penetrating into the disposition of the man, incorporating itself with his actions, ruling him in the form of love ; and together with this love, as the union with the godlike, arises the life of contemplation, the peculiar element of the Gnostic point of view, and the highest thing of all ; but which he considers not as a mere theorizing state of mind, but as the highest transfiguration of Christianity in the complete unity of life and knowledge. "Faith," says he, "is a certain relation of the soul to the supernatural — the godlike ;† — an immediate union of the spirit with God, so that the being of God in man is therewith necessarily presupposed. The kingdom of God, and faith in God, differ only in the abstract conception. Faith is the kingdom of God, which has not yet come to a determinate shape, — the kingdom of God is faith, which has attained to shape in a way answering to the divine life.‡ The faith which is actively employed in obeying the divine commands becomes the kingdom of God, which can be known only by those who possess it, and the kingdom of God is nothing other than operative faith." In speaking against those who considered the charismata as isolated gifts, simply communicated from without, he says,§ "He who has genuine faith in Christ, has within him all the charismata collectively. But since, by reason of our inactivity, we are far from that active love towards him, which unveils to us the divine treasures which we bear within our own souls, so we justly believe that we are without the divine charismata. If, according to St. Paul, Christ dwells in our hearts by faith,

\* The divine wisdom, in having respect to the ἀναλογία τῶν προνοειμένων. Quæst. 31, p. 74.

† The πίστις δύναμις σχετικὴ τῆς ὑπὸ φύσιν ἀμίσου τῶν πιστίσματος πρὸς τὸν πιστινόμαν θεὸν τελίας ἵνασται. Quæst. 33 in script. T. I. 76, and the following.

‡ L. c. ἡ μὲν πίστις ἀνθίσιος θεοῦ βασιλείας ἤτοι, ἡ δὲ βασιλεία, πίστις θεοῦ εἰδεστησαντίν.

§ In the thoughts concerning charity, I. f. 453.

## MAXIMUS ON PRAYER.

and in him are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge; then all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are hidden in our hearts. But they reveal themselves to the heart in the same proportion as the heart becomes pure, through obedience to the divine commands." Of love he says,\* contemplating it as the perfection of the Christian life—"What kind of good is there, which love possesses not? Does it not possess faith, which bestows on him that has it as firm and assured a conviction of the godlike as the sensuous perception of the eye can bestow of visible objects? Does it not possess a hope, which represents to itself the truly good, and grasps it more firmly than the hand ever grasps an object which can be felt? Does it not bestow the enjoyment of that which is believed and hoped for, when, by virtue of the whole bent of the soul, it possesses in itself the future as the present?"† With regard to the union of the theoretical with the practical element, he says that he who represents to himself knowledge as something embodied in action, and action as something instinct with knowledge, has found the right way of true divine action; but he who severs the one from the other, either converts knowledge into an unsubstantial fancy, or action into a lifeless shadow.‡

In describing how the whole life of the Christian should be one prayer, Maximus explains himself thus: Constant prayer consists in this, that one has his mind constantly directed to God in true piety and sincere aspiration; that the whole life should be rooted and grounded in hope on him; that in everything one does or suffers, one's whole reliance is placed only in him.§ He nowhere suffers himself to fall into the mistake, into which the mystics were often misled, that of confounding together eternal life and the present earthly existence. He thus contrasts them: One is the relative knowledge of the godlike by conceptions, which consists in the striving after that perfect union with the object of knowledge which, in this life, is not yet to be attained; the other, the absolute, perfect intuition,

\* In a letter, T. II. p. 220.

† Δι' ιαυτῆς ὁ ταῦτα τὰ μίλλοντα κατὰ διάβολον ἔχουσα.

‡ "Η τὴν γνῶσιν αντίστοταν πιποίησι Φαντασίαν ἡ τὴν πρᾶξην ἀψυχον κατίστησιν οἴων. Among the scattered thoughts, which harmonize well with his other writings. I. 606.

§ See his ἀσπεττάσι, I. p. 378.

in immediate presence, where knowledge by conception retires into the back-ground.\* The fundamental ideas of Maximus seem to lead to the doctrine of a final universal restoration, which in fact is intimately connected also with the system of Gregory of Nyssa, to which he most closely adheres. Yet he was too much fettered by the church system of doctrine, distinctly to express any theory of this sort †

The first doctrinal controversy which we have to notice in the Greek church of this period, originated partly in causes within, and partly in causes without the church itself. The internal cause was the effort to unfold from the doctrine of the two natures in Christ the consequences which it involved. The doctrine of the two natures in Christ combined together in personal union, while each retained its own attributes unaltered, would, if consistently carried out, lead men also to suppose two forms of working corresponding to these two natures; as, in fact, they allowed to subsist along with the two natures the attributes also, answering to each, which remained unaltered. The external cause of these controversies was, as had so often been the case, the inclination of

\* Ἡ μὲν τῶν θιων γῆνοι, σχετικη, ἡ, ἐν οὐνα λόγῳ κείμενη καὶ ιούμαση, δὶς κορίσις αλτροῦ, οὐ μονη τοι τερα καὶ τη γενεα διχα λόγοι γαὶ ιορμάστω δὲν τοι γνωσθεντα, κατα γαῖν οὐ δὲ, παροχορην την αισθησιν, δὶς κατα την μέλασσαν λεῖν την ιτερ φυσιν υποδέχοντα θεων υπαντειν ενεργουμένην. Quast script 1. 10

10

† In the collection of Aphorisms derived from Maximus, the *κατατοτας τιταγετ*, sec 20 T I f 28, the reunion of all rational essences with God is established as the final end προ, υποδέχεται τοι παντας πάσιν ιωαντονιου κατα τη προ, τῶν αιωνων. In his *ιωαντος και ἀποκρίσις*, c 13 I f. 04, he himself cites Gregory's doctrine concerning the restoration, and with approbation but explains it thus τας παραγραφησιας της ψυχῆς, διαμει, τη πολεται τῶν αιωνων οποβαλλει τὰς ιωτεδίσιας αυτῆς τη κακία, μηνο, και τη απασαν του, παντας αιώνας και μη εύστοκουσαν στατιν εις τη δο οὐδειν τη μη εχοντα πίστα, But then he adds, και ου-ω, τη επιζωτι, ο τη μητρι, των ἀγαθων αποδειν τὰς διωδεις και ει, το αγωνιον αποκε-κοινιι και διηθενται τοι δημιουργον διώδιον της ἀμερτια. According to this, then, God will finally be glorified by the complete extirpation of all evil. Yet how, according to his own ideas, he could distinguish the knowledge of the highest good, in which all would participate, from the participation in it, cannot be well seen. In expounding Colos 11 15, from different points of view (Quast script 21), he had in his mind perhaps (see T. I f. 44) a final redemption even of fallen spirits, since he says, that there is also a λόγος μαντικώτερος και ὑψηλοτερος, but that we are not authorized to rely on the αποφριτότερα τῶν θιων δογματων of Scripture.

the Byzantine emperors to intermeddle with the ecclesiastical proceedings; and in particular the effort, so often made without success, and from which they still could not desist, to bring about a conciliation of the opposite doctrinal views existing in the church by means of formulas designed to conceal the existing differences. It was not merely a religious, but also a political interest by which the Greek emperor Heraclius, whose arms were successful in recovering the provinces rent from the Greek empire by the Persians, was led to desire this. It was to him a matter of great political importance to strengthen the power of the Greek empire by re-uniting the large body constituting the Monophysite party with the dominant church of the empire. The interviews he had had with Monophysite bishops, whom he happened to meet in his campaigns during the war against the Persians in 622 and the following years, inspired him with the thought, that the formulary of one divinely human mode of working and willing in Christ, might serve the purpose of bringing about the result which had been so long sought in vain, and if not to reconcile, at least to render harmless to the unity of the church, the opposition between the Monophysite party and the Catholic church, which held fast to the decisions of the Chalcedonian council. The formulary—one mode of Christ's willing and working—seemed the less liable to give offence, because in the writings of Dionysius the Areopagite, which stood in the same high authority with both the parties, an ἐνέργεια θεαρδοκυή, was set down as the distinguishing predicate of Christ.\* Heraclius by no means

\* It cannot, indeed, be proved, that the emperor, when he first hit upon this formulary, had this object in view. It is possible that having heard, perhaps from Monophysite bishops, in conversation, some such expression, and not knowing what to think of it, he consulted on the subject his patriarch at Constantinople; or that the Monophysite bishops of the dominant church, had, in the course of some discussion, raised it as an objection, that as they supposed two natures in Christ, they must also affirm two modes of willing and working; and that the emperor was thus led to ask the opinion of the patriarch whether it might not be right to suppose one mode of willing and working. It is possible, that bishop Cyrus also, when he first spoke with the emperor, and consulted the patriarch Sergius about this formulary, had no thoughts of employing it as a means for higher objects. It is possible, that his elevation to the Alexandrian patriarchate stood in no connection whatever with these transactions; and that it was only by occasion of this elevation

designed to make this formulary of doctrine a universally dominant one in the church. He was governed here far more by political than by doctrinal motives; and without taking any particular interest in the doctrinal disputes, or wishing to have any influence in determining the doctrines of the church, his only object was to employ this formulary as a means for promoting union in districts where the Monophysite party was numerous and powerful, as was the case in the Alexandrian diocese. The patriarch Sergius, of Constantinople, whom the emperor consulted touching the propriety of employing this formulary, having found nothing offensive in it, he was the more confirmed in his contemplated project.\* Perhaps the use which Heraclius was making of this formulary, would never have engendered a controversy, if he had not finally succeeded by it in effecting his purpose among the Monophysites in the Alexandrian church.

Among the bishops with whom the emperor had conversed on this subject was Cyrus, bishop of Phasis, in the territory of the Lazians of Colchis. As the latter felt some scruples about the employment of this formulary, he applied for advice to the patriarch Sergius of Constantinople.† Sergius sought in his reply to remove these scruples:‡ but in so doing he expressed himself very ambiguously, showing the want of an independent theological judgment of his own. He wrote him that at ecumenical councils this subject had never come under discussion, nor had anything been determined about it. Several eminent fathers had used the phrase *one mode of working*, but as yet he had found no one who approved the phrase *two modes of working*. If however any such case could be pointed out, it would be necessary to follow that authority, for that he was led to make such a use of this formulary. Great mistakes are often made, by reasoning back from some result really brought about by a concurrence of circumstances to the motives of individuals; still, however, the interest shown by the emperor in this formulary, renders it probable that from the first it appeared to him an important means to this end; and by comparing this case with the like attempts to bring about a union with the Monophysites, as for example, the added clause to the Trishagion, the condemnation of the three chapters, we shall find much serving to confirm this view of the matter.

\* That the emperor had for this reason applied to the patriarch, may be gathered from the letter of bishop Cyrus to him soon to be mentioned. Harduin. Concil. T. III. 1338.

† See l. c.

‡ See the tract l. c. f. 1309.

men were bound not merely to seek to agree with the fathers in doctrine, but also to use the same language with them, and to be cautious of all innovations.\* To such a pitch of extravagance was carried this slavery to the letter, which substituted the sayings of individual men in place of an independent examination of doctrines!† Nevertheless, Cyrus represented himself as satisfied by this decision of the patriarch; and we may conjecture that it was to his approbation of this formulæry, and his declared readiness to form a union with the Monophysites, he was indebted for his elevation to the patriarchate of Alexandria, in the year 630. He actually succeeded to bring back thousands of the Monophysites in Egypt and the adjacent provinces, who had remained hitherto separated from the dominant church, to re-unite with the same, by means of a doctrinal compromise, established on nine points, which compromise placed the peculiar articles of Monophysitism beside those of the creed of the Chalcedonian council; so that every man could explain the one in conformity with the other.‡ And in the seventh article of this compromise it was derived as a consequence, from the idea of the real§ union of the two natures, that the one Christ and Son of God works that which is divine, and that which is human, by one divinely human mode of agency.||

But this compromise¶ met with the same fate, with all the earlier attempts at conciliation; namely, the union thus

\* Πᾶσα γὰρ ἡδύκην μὴ μόνον κατ' ἵνοιαν τοῖς τὰν ἀγίαν πατίσσων ἄποικοι δέργασσον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ταῖς αὐταῖς ἵναις κεχρῆσσαι φανταῖς καὶ μηδὲ τὸ παράπτων κανονογομαῖν.

† It deserves to be noticed, that Sergius, in his reply, makes no mention whatever of his own earlier explanation, to which Cyrus had appealed. It might be inferred from this, though it is not certain, that Sergius in that explanation had been moved by the wishes of the emperor to express himself in too decided a manner in favour of that formulæry; so that he was now willing to ignore it.

‡ Namely, on the one hand, *μεταχριστὸς* in δύο φύσεις, on the other, *ἴνα χριστὸς* in δυοῖς θιαρεῖσιν ταῖς φύσεις, are brought together by the expression *μία φύσις τοῦ λόγου σταυρωμένη* and *μία ὑπόστασις σύνθετη, ἴνασις φυσική* and *ἴνασις καθ' ὑπόστασιν*.

§ Not merely *φαντασία, φύνδη καὶ διὰ κίνοις νοῦ διαπλάσματα.*

¶ Τὸν αὐτὸν ἴνα χριστὸν καὶ μίαν ἴνεργοντα τὰ θιαρεῖση καὶ ἀνθεάτην μία θιανδρικὴ ινεργεία. See the formula of union in the 13th action of the 6th ecumenical council. Harduin. III. 1342.

|| Called by the Greeks the *ἴνασις ὑδροπαφής*, because it so quickly came to nothing.

brought about was soon dissolved again; and new schisms sprung out of it. There was then residing at Alexandria an eminent monk of Palestine, by name Sophronius,\* who with logical consistency defended the system of the two natures, and was not inclined to sacrifice consistency in doctrine to church policy. To him the doctrine of one mode of working and willing seemed to lead necessarily to Monophysitism; and an accommodation (*οἰκονομία* was the word) ventured upon at the expense of truth, in order to promote the peace of the church, was a thing he could by no means approve. It was agreed on both sides to leave the matter to the patriarch Sergius, and Sophronius himself went to see him. Sergius foresaw the important consequences which this opposition, once agitated, might have; and he sought to suppress the controversy in the bud. It is true, he himself perhaps approved the phrase one mode of willing and working; yet he was of the opinion that it would be wrong to make a law and a dogma for the church out of the manner in which only a few approved fathers, in a few passages, and but occasionally, had expressed themselves; and it was necessary to avoid this phrase in the public language of the church, because, to many it might give offence, and be so misapprehended, as if the doctrine—which was by no means implied therein—of one nature, might be deduced from it. He was more decided, however, with regard to the phrase “two modes of willing and working,” not merely on account of its possible abuse, but because this phrase seemed to him to denote something that was false in itself. Men would be led thereby to conceive of two opposite wills of the Logos, and of the humanity in Christ, to annul the true unity of the person of Christ,asmuch as two wills cannot be conceived to exist at the same time in one person. It was, therefore, safest to use none but the doctrinal formulas hitherto employed, as these perfectly answered the interests of Christian faith. He therefore advised the patriarch Cyrus to make no change in the compromise at Alexandria, which was

\* Sophronius was, in his younger years, known as a learned man and teacher, under the name of the *Sophist*. This was before he became a monk, if, as it is probable, he is the same with the one to whom Johannes Moschus dedicated his history of the monks (*λιγίαν αναπαρίστες*) and of whose resolutions to quit the life of the world he speaks in this history, c. 110.

so important for the peace of the churches, and which could not be dissolved without prejudice to the same ; but after having attained his object, no longer to speak either of "one mode of willing and working," or of "two," but only to hold fast to this, that the self-same Christ, the true God, works that which is divine, and that which is human, and all the divine and human agency proceeds, undivided, from the same incarnate Logos, and is to be referred back to him. And Sophronius finally promised the patriarch that he would refrain from both forms of expression, and from all dispute about them.\* Much, we must allow, depends on the form in which Sophronius worded this promise, in judging as to his good faith and sincerity. On this point we can form no opinion, since we have only the report of Sergius, who was a party in the case ; but, at all events, Sophronius believed himself bound by the promise he had given only so long as he remained in this subordinate relation of dependence as a monk. From this he was removed, and attained himself to one of the highest stations in the general guidance of the church ; for he was made in 634 patriarch of Jerusalem. As Sergius now had reason, no doubt, to dread the zeal of Sophronius, who, by this new position, had acquired so great an influence, he endeavoured to procure, as a counterpoise to this, the concurrent decision of the Roman bishop Honorius. He informed the latter† of what had thus far been done, and asked him for his own judgment. Honorius, in two letters, declared his entire concurrence with the views of Sergius, and wrote also in the same terms to Cyrus and Sophronius. He, too, was afraid of logical determinations on such matters. It seemed to him altogether necessary‡ to suppose but one will in Christ, as it was impossible to conceive in him any strife between the human and the divine will, such as by reason of sin exists in men.§ He approved, indeed, of

\* The source of these accounts is the relation, faithful as it seems to the truth, of the patriarch Sergius to the Roman bishop Honorius, in the twelfth actio of the sixth ecumenical council. Haiduin. III. f. 1315.

† See the last cited letter of Sergius, l. c.

‡ See l. c. f. 1319.

§ Nam lex alia in membris aut voluntas diversa non fuit vel contraria salvatori, quia super legem natus est humanæ conditionis. Now to such passages, the defenders of Honorius on the principles of church orthodoxy might appeal, in order to show that he had not attacked the doctrine of two natures in Christ, by itself considered, but only the

the accommodation (*oikonomia*), whereby the patriarch Cyrus had brought about the re-union of the Monophysites with the Catholic church; but as hitherto no public decision of the church had spoken of "one mode of working" or of "two modes of working" of Christ, it seemed to him the safest course that in future such expressions should be avoided, as the one might lead to Nestorianism, the other to Eutychianism.

He reckoned this whole question among the unprofitable subtleties which endanger the interests of piety. Men should be content to hold fast to this, in accordance with the hitherto established doctrine of the church, that the self-same Christ works that which is divine and human in both his natures.\* Those other questions should be left to the grammarians in the schools. If the holy spirit operates in the faithful, as St. Paul says, in manifold ways, how much more must this hold good of the Head himself! Meantime Sophronius, in the circular letter which, according to ancient custom, he issued on entering upon his office,† when laying down a full confession of his faith, presented at the same time the doctrine of two modes of operation answering to the two natures in Christ as a necessary consequence, flowing from the doctrine of the two natures. He by no means rejected the phrase *ērēpyēia θeandōtikή* (divinely-human agency); but he maintained that this stood in no sort of contradiction with the designating of two modes of operation answering to the peculiar natures; but referred to quite another thing, to that which is not predicated of one of the natures in particular, but of the action of both in union with each other, of the collective activity of the person of Christ. True, Palestine, soon after Sophronius had issued this letter, was, by the conquest of the Saracens, severed from its connection with the rest of the Christian world. But the con-

hypothesis of an opposition between the divine and the human will in Christ. This defence, however, will not stand the test of examination, for it seemed to him, as well as to Sergius, that a duplicity of will in one and the same subject could not subsist in fact without opposition.

\* In the second letter, f. 1354: *Unus operator Christus in utrisque naturis, dñe naturæ in una persona inconfuse, indivise, inconvertibiliter propria operante*,—although the theory of two modes of working lies at the foundation of the very thing he here asserts, yet he carefully avoided expressing this.

† His *γράμματα ιεροσολυματικά* in the XI. actio of the VI. ecumenical council, Hard. III. 1258, and what follows.

troversy must already have spread to a considerable extent; for the emperor Heraclius considered it necessary to resort, for the purpose of suppressing it, to a common expedient, which generally served but to aggravate the evil. He issued, in 638, a dogmatic edict, under the name of the Ecthesis, without doubt the work of Sergius,\* drawn up according to the principles which Sergius had hitherto always expressed. The doctrine of one person of Christ in two natures was held forth conformably to the doctrine of the church, and that one and the self-same Christ works that which is divine, and that which is human, was affirmed; but the phrases one energy (*ένέργεια*) or two energies were to be avoided, the first because, though it had been employed by some of the fathers, it yet created uneasiness in many, who supposed that such an expression carried with it the denial of the duality of natures; the second, because it had been used by no one of the approved church-teachers, and because it gave offence to many.† There would, moreover, follow from it the hypothesis of two contradictory wills in Christ, which Nestorius himself had not ventured to assert. Following the doctrine of the fathers, it was necessary, on the contrary, to affirm one will of Christ; since the humanity with its own rational soul had never determined itself out of its own will, in opposition to the will of the Logos united with it, but always so as the Logos willed.‡

This edict expressed itself in language too favourable to the doctrine of "one mode of willing and working" ever to satisfy the opponents of the latter doctrine. Nor were the defenders of Dyotheticism contented to be merely tolerated; but the doctrine of two modes of willing and working, corresponding to the two natures, seemed to them closely connected with the true idea of the Redeemer, and of the redemption; and it would, therefore, be considered by them of the greatest importance that the same should be adopted into the church system of faith. The majority of the Greek bishops were wont, it is

\* *Ἐκθεσις τῆς πίστεως.*

† It is easy to see, that the language is stronger against the second expression, than against the first.

‡ Ως ίν μπονί κατεργή τῆς νοερᾶς ιψυχωμένης αὐτοῦ σωρκὸς ποχωσιομένης καὶ ἐξ οἰκίας ὅρμης ιναντίως τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ ινωμίου αὐτῷ καὶ ἵπτοτασι θεῖος λόγου τὴν φυσικὴν αὐτῆς ποιησασθαι κληπον, ἀλλ' εἰστέ καὶ οἵας καὶ θεῖοι αὐτές ὁ θεῖος λόγος ἴθουλετο. Harduin. III. 796.

true, to be governed by the prevailing tendency of the court. The patriarch Sergius could easily convoke at Constantinople an *endemic* council (*σύνοδος ἐπιδημούσα*), which would approve the new religious edict; nor would there be much difficulty in compelling to acquiescence the majority of the other bishops of Asia. But the arm of the emperor was powerless in the provinces of Africa and of Italy; where, besides, a more independent hierarchical spirit opposed itself to the influence of court dogmatism. There was one man in particular who, by his acuteness as a dialectician, by his activity, and his invincible courage, was singularly fitted to take the lead of the party opposed to Monotheletism, and to concentrate all his powers to this object. This was the above-mentioned *Maximus*, who had then retired to the monastic life.

As he must be called the most important representative of Dyotheticism, so *Theodore*, bishop of Pharan, in Arabia, of whom, however, we know nothing except from single fragments of his writings, was the most important doctrinal representative and spokesman of the opposite party. Now, as to the dogmatic interest connected with this latter tendency, the truth was, it attached itself to the reigning mode of thinking and speaking since the last decision of the controversy about the two natures of Christ, by virtue of which mode of thinking and speaking, the formulary—"One incarnate nature of the Logos"—was joined with the formulary—"two natures;" and without infringing on the abiding duality of the natures, it was thought possible to refer the human nature, as well as the divine, to the one incarnate Logos as one personal subject; and in thus referring it, a special religious interest was involved. Accordingly, it was now considered of importance to say that it was not, so to speak, the self-subsistent human nature in Christ that was subject to, and submitted itself to, the sensuous affections, but that everything human in Christ was no less a free act than the assumption of human nature itself; all sprung from the one will and the one activity of the Logos; all appropriation of purely human attributes and affections was, in fact, nothing else than a continued exertion of that one determination of will and act, by virtue of which the Logos, from the first, appropriated to himself the human nature. All the actions and sufferings of Christ proceed from three factors: the efficient cause in them all is the *divine*

*will*, the divine agency as the determining power; and this operates *by means of the rational soul*, and through the *body* as its instrument.\* Whatever pain or suffering of Christ we may choose to name, it must still be considered, and justly, as the one activity of the same Christ.† God is the author of all—the humanity the instrument which he makes use of.‡ On the contrary, Maximus affirms:—For the complete redemption of human nature it was requisite that God should appropriate it with the identity and totality of all its powers without sin, in order to purify human nature from sin in all its parts, and to interpenetrate it with a principle of divine life. Whatever was not taken up into this union would therefore remain excluded from redemption. In particular, the will peculiar to man's rational nature, as that by which sin is brought about, must be assumed into this union, and thereby sanctified.§ Neither human nature generally, nor the nature of any other being whatsoever, can subsist separate from its peculiar powers; nor, accordingly, human nature, without its ἐρέγεια and θελησι (powers of working and willing). It is impossible, therefore, without recognizing this, to affirm any true incarnation of the Logos: he who does not recognize it must fall into Docetism. He refers to all those passages of the gospel history which speak of a willing or a working of Christ with respect to anything limited and sensuous—his walking, eating, &c. This does not admit of being transferred to the infinite all-present will, and to the infinite all-present agency of God. It would be necessary, therefore, to understand all this after the manner of Docetism, unless we attributed to the

\* Μία εἰργυια τοῦ λογου, τοῦ νοῦ, τοῦ αἰσθητικοῦ σάματος καὶ θεραπεικοῦ ταῦτα λεχθέν. Παντα δέ της σωτηριώδεις οἰκονομίας μήτε θεία μήτε αὐτεράποτα πρὶν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν χριστοῦ ανιστορηταί ἀλλοιδῶς μὲν ἐν τοῦ θείου την ἔνδοσιν καὶ την αἵτινα ἀλεργασίαν, διὰ μίστης δὲ τῆς νοτρᾶς καὶ λογικῆς ψυχῆς ἐπονεγμένο ταρά τοῦ σωτάτου. See the fragments of Theodore of Pharia, in the acts of the VI. Ecumenical Council, actio 13. Harduin. Concil. T. III. f. 1343, and 44.

† Ο σταυρός, ἡ νίκησις, εἰ μάλιστε, ἡ ὀπτιλὴ καὶ καθηλωσις, τὰ ἡραπόντα, τα φατισματα, πα τα ταῦτα ὅρθας ἦν καὶ δικαίως κληπτικά μία καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ θεος χριστοῦ ινίργυα.

‡ Μία ινίργυα, ἡς τεχνίτης καὶ δημιουργὸς ὁ Θεὸς, ὅργανον δὲ ἡ αὐτεράποτη.

§ Εἰ ταραζόντες τὴν ἴντολὴν διὸ θελήσως σ' ὅλα' εὐ δίχα θελήσως παρίσημον ιδίσματα τῆς κατ' αὐτὴν λατρείας, τῇ πρεσβολῇψι τοῦ ἴμοιν τὸ ὅμοιον αὐτοῦ δὲ τοῦ σαρκανίντος θεοῦ θεματινόντες. opp. ed. Compl. f. 88.

human nature in Christ the Θελησις and ἐνέργεια which are peculiar to it.\* When the divine Logos became man, he appropriated along with the human nature the inclinations and aversions also which belong to that nature—the positive and negative impulses which lie within it; and he gave signs of both in his life.† Maximus said, for example, that as there is implanted in each creature an impulse for self-preservation, and therefore along with this positive principle a negative one,‡ the natural feeling which struggles against the extinction of life; so this feeling, inasmuch as it belongs to the essence of human nature, must have existed in the case of Christ, and indeed was manifested by him at the approach of death. But the schism existing between this natural impulse and reason—the irrational tendency of it growing out of sin, the fear of death in conflict with the call of duty—such a tendency could find no place in him.§ But with all this, Maximus also derived, from the hypostatic union, a consequence in which he

\* In truth, there is to be found in Monotheletism, as it is expressed by Theodore of Pharan, much that borders on Docetism. For example, he regards it as the peculiar character of all bodily affections in the case of Christ, that he, as man, was not subjected to these affections by any natural necessity, but produced them, each moment, by the divine will, to which the corporeal nature must, of necessity, be subjected; that, by virtue of its appropriation by the Logos, the body of Christ had become, in a sense, deified and spiritualized, and could be freed from the limitations and defects of a corporeal nature, or subjected to them as he pleased:—hence the miracles. Ή γὰρ ἡμίτινον φυχὴν οὐ θεῖναι τοσαύτης ὀντάσιας εἶναι, ἵνα τὰς φυσικὰς τοῦ σωματος ἰδιότητας οὐκτὸν τι καὶ ιαυτῆς αἰτιαλόνην. As this was so in the case of Christ, hence the ἀνθρωπότης τῶν συμφωνῶν τοῦ σώματος, ὅγκοι, ἥπης καὶ χούματος; hence, that Christ αἴρεται καὶ εἰνὶ ἔπειν ἀσωματός; ἀντὶ διαστολῆς προπληθεῖς μητρέας καὶ μνήματος καὶ θύρου καὶ ὡς ἡ' ἰδιαφούς τῆς Θαλάσσης ιπτίζεται. In one point Maximus did, it is true, agree with him; namely, in holding that Christ was not subjected to bodily sufferings, by any necessity of nature, but that he subjected himself to them by a free act of the will, κατ' εἰενομίαν, for the good of mankind.

† Τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος τὴν ὄρμὴν καὶ ἀφορμὴν Θίλων δὲ ἵνεσι, τὴν μὲν ὄρμην, ἵνα τοῖς φυσικοῖς καὶ ἀδιανόητοις τοσοῦτον χρήσονται, ὡς καὶ μὲν Θίλη τοῖς ἀπίστοις νομίζονται, τὴν δὲ ἀφορμὴν ἵνα καιρῷ τοῦ πάθους, ιανούσιος τὴν πρᾶς τοῦ Σάνατον συστολὴν αποτασσονται. Disputat. c. Pyrrho. L. c. f. 165.

‡ The ἀφορμή, the opposite to the ὄρμη.

§ Εστὶ γὰρ καὶ πάτα φύσιν καὶ παρὰ φύσιν διελία καὶ πάτα φύσιν μὲν διελία λοιπὸν δύναμις πατὰ συστολὴν τοῦ ὄντος ἀνθεκτήν, παρὰ φύσιν δὲ παράλογος συστολή.

agreed with the Monotheletians, in that he represents the *Logos* to be efficient, after a peculiar manner, as the personal subject in all these cases, so that the *Logos* revealed, in the form of the peculiar human "working" and "willing," his own agency for the salvation of mankind. Hence natural necessity is, in every case, to be excluded; everything occurred in a manner entirely different from what is otherwise usual in human nature; everything took place in a divine and supernatural, and, at the same time, a human and natural way.\* Accordingly Maximus also admitted an *ἐνέργεια θεανθρακή* (a divinely-human activity) in *his own* sense, as denoting the activity of one subject, viz., the *Logos* become man, in the forms at once of the divine and the human nature, by virtue of a *τρύπτος ἀντιδόσεως* (the interchange of attributes), which applied to the peculiar properties of each nature.†

The question concerning the relations of the human and the divine will to each other in Christ was connected also, in a way that deserves notice, with the question respecting the relation of the human to the divine will in the redeemed in their state of perfection. At least, many among the Monotheletes supposed the final result of the perfect development of the divine life in believers would be in them, as in the case of Christ, a total absorption of the human will in God's will; so that in all there would be a subjective as well as objective identity of will, which, consistently carried out, would lead to the pantheistic notion of an entire absorption of all individuality of existence in the one original spirit. Maximus well understood this, and contended earnestly against the notion. He maintained that, regarded on the objective side with reference to the object of God's will, which was also the same for all, and with reference to the energising principle of divine grace, which is the same, there was indeed one will in all: but that, notwithstanding this, the subjective difference would ever remain, the difference, namely, between the will in God,

\* Οὐ προηγήτας οὐ τῷ λορίῳ καθάπτει οὐ ἡμῖν τῆς θελήσεως τὰ φύσικα, ἀλλ' ἄστεγε πινακαστικά ἀληθές καὶ θεῖψας οὐ τρόπῳ τῷ καθ' ἡμᾶς ιστίσασιν καὶ ιδιψησιν, ἀλλὰ τῷ ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς, ικονισμῷ γόρε, οὐτως καὶ διλιαστικά ἀληθές, οὐ καθ' ἡμᾶς, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς ιδείσασιν καὶ καθοδοῦ φάναι, τὰν φυσικὸν ιτάχεσσον συνεμμένον ἔχει τῷ κατ' αὐτὸν λόγῳ καὶ τὸν ὑπὲρ φύσιν τρόπον οὐαὶ οὐ φύσις διὰ τοῦ λόγου πιστοῦται καὶ οὐ εἰκονομία διὰ τοῦ τρόπου.

† That which, in later times, was called *communicatio idiomatum*.

which works salvation, and the will of those who receive it from him.\* We may now see also how closely connected this doctrine of Maximus was with the general principle, so important to him concerning the revelation of the supernatural and divine in the more highly refined form and individuality of the natural—a view with which the other theory stood directly in conflict. As to the appeals made on both sides to the declarations of the older fathers, the truth was that, under the influence of their different dogmatical interests, each party would be so much the more likely to differ from the other in their interpretations, as the older fathers, who had no such controversy in their thoughts, expressed themselves very indefinitely on such points.†

In Constantinople, the imperial edict still continued valid, even after the death of Heraclius, in 641; but the successors of Honorius bishop of Rome, who died soon after the breaking out of these disputes, declared themselves decidedly against Monothelitism, and in favour of the doctrine of the two modes of willing and working. This dogmatic tendency prevailed also in the African church. Maximus repaired to these districts: he increased, by his influence, the zeal in behalf of it; and used the authority of these churches, especially the Roman, to put down Monothelitism. From Africa and Rome he directed letters and tracts to the monks of the East, in which he combated that system. In Africa he was supported by the governor Gregorius, who was plotting an insurrection

\* Τὸν τι σωζόμενον πρὸς ἀλλόλους καὶ θιοῦ τοῦ σάδυοντος κατὰ τὴν θίλητον γεννήσας σύμβασις ὅλη ἐν πᾶσι γενικῶς· καὶ τὸ καθ ἕκαστον ἰδικῶς· χωρῆστος τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ τὰ πάντα πληρῶντος τῷ μίτρᾳ τῆς χάριτος καὶ ἐν πᾶσι πλησουμένου μελῶν δικῶν κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς ἐν εκάστῳ πίστεως. T. II. f. 10, 11. He also points out, in his disputation with Pyrrhus, the ambiguity which arises from expressing the θίλητα and the θίλητός by the same word. II. f. 162.

† Thus in particular they differed about the right interpretation and reading of the passage in the fourth supposed letter of Dionysius to Caius, where an Ἱερόντια θιαρδεική is ascribed to Christ. According to the context of this passage, the reading *μίαν*, defended by the Monothelites, would not be the correct one, but the reading *καὶ μίαν*, defended by the opposite party; for it is plainly the author's design to mark that which was *new* in the appearance of the God-man; but perhaps all the definiteness here given to the word θιαρδεική originated in glosses. At all events, each party could at least explain the words in its own sense.

against the imperial government, and wanted, perhaps, to avail himself of the excitement growing out of these doctrinal disputes to further his own plans. A great sensation was created in Africa by a public transaction in which Maximus was the principal actor. The patriarch Pyrrhus, successor to Sergius, who, up to this time, had himself also maintained the validity of the *Ecthesis*, had been driven, by the tide of popular feeling excited against him, to resign his post, in the year 642, and had betaken himself to North Africa. A disputation between him and Maximus was held in presence of a numerous assemblage and of the governor Gregory. Maximus, it is true, displayed great acuteness in the management of his cause; and in this respect he was far superior to his opponent. Nevertheless it was, beyond doubt, an outward interest, far more than this intellectual superiority or any force of argument, which induced Pyrrhus to own that he was beaten; upon which confession he was solemnly restored, by the Roman bishop Theodore, to the communion of the church. But he very soon went over again to the other party.

The long continued troubles which arose out of these disputes moved the emperor Constans, in 648, to revoke the *Ecthesis* and to publish a new religious edict, known under the name of the *Type*.\* Although this edict was drawn up under the influence of the patriarch Paul, and although this prelate, as is plain from his correspondence with the Roman bishops, was devoted to Monotheletism, yet his peculiar doctrinal views were not thrust so prominently to view as those of Sergius had been in the *Ecthesis*. He must have known how to distinguish the duty of a church-teacher from that of a civil ruler, or perhaps he considered this dogmatic difference as of too little importance to be suffered to disturb the peace of the church; at least he did not wish to use the authority of the emperor to introduce Monotheletism into the church. The *Type* was clearly distinguished from the *Ecthesis* in this essential respect, that the doctrinal element therein retired further out of view; and, without taking part in any way either with Monotheletism or against it, the edict was chiefly aimed to restrain the violent disputes, and to restore quiet to the

\* Τύπος τῆς πίστεως.

church.\* After having presented the two opposite views, deciding in favour of neither, it ordered that the church should abide by the doctrine as it stood before the outbreak of this controversy, and contend no longer about these points. No person should stigmatize another as a heretic on account of them. The *clergy*, who acted contrary to this, should be deposed; the monks banished; persons in office, whether in the civil or in the military service, should forfeit their places; private individuals of rank should be punished by the confiscation of their goods; those of the lower order, after being corporeally punished, should be perpetually banished.† But though the well-meant purpose was here aimed at of putting an end, by this ordinance, to the passionate dispute on both sides, yet such an object could not be so attained, for no magisterial word has power to command on matters of religious convictions. Those to whom the subject in dispute seemed so important would only be the more excited to controversy by the very prohibition of it, which seemed to them either the fruit of an unchristian *indifferentism*, or a sly trick to check, for the present, the free assertion of the truth. To the zealots for the doctrine of the two modes of willing and working, the *Type* appeared under the aspect as if Christ was thereby made a being without will or free agency—placed on a level with deaf and dumb idols.‡ Martin I., the zealous opponent of Monothelitism, who, even before this, while Apocrisiarius of the Roman church at Constantinople, had violently opposed it, became, when pope, the most important pillar of this party. From different quarters of the East and the West, he received

\* The imperial commissioners, who attended the trial of Maximus at Constantinople, could no doubt rightly say, the emperor had dropped the *Type* simply—*διὰ τὴν σιρῆνα, οὐκ ἵν αὐτοῖς τινος τῶν ἐπὶ χριστοῦ νομοῦσιν, ἀλλ᾽ ἵν σιρῆνα τὴν σωτῆνα τὴν ποιουσῶν τὴν διάστασιν ταῦτα εἰσοδοῦντα.* See *Acta Maximi*, prefixed to the edition of his works, T. I. s. 8, f. 36.

† See the *Acta of the Lateran Council*, Act. IV. T. III. Harduin. f. 824.

‡ In a query addressed by the monk Maximus, with other Greek monks, to the Lateran council, the following remarks are made respecting the *Type*: *Εἰς ἐάνιστον τάντη καὶ ἀνίστατο, τουτίστιν ἀντι καὶ ἀψύχοι καὶ ἀκίνητοι αὐτὸν τὸν τῆς δέξης θιν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν ἵσσον χερστὸν θεομάτισσαν τοῖς τῶν ιθαῖς ἀψύχοις παραπλησίων ιδεῖσθαι, and then Ps. cxv. is cited, ταῦτος γὰρ ἀπαν τὸ ἀνιστρυγον τάντη καὶ ἀνίστατο.* Harduin. *Concil. T. III. f. 724.*

communications from the monks and clergy, complaining that truth was suppressed by the edict which, though it appeared under the name of the emperor, was supposed to have really proceeded from the patriarch of Constantinople. As successor of St. Peter, he believed himself called upon, as he was invited by these voices from different quarters, to watch over the preservation of pure doctrine in the whole church. Without consulting the emperor, he convoked a council, in 648, to meet at Rome in the Constantinopolitan church, which stood in the vicinity of the former Lateran palace, and was hence called the ecclesia Lateranensis. This was a general council, afterwards known under the name of the Lateran council. By this assembly twenty canons were drawn up in opposition to Monothelitism. The doctrine of two modes of willing and working, combined in union, was established; and sentence of condemnation pronounced on the opposite doctrine and on its advocates, namely, all the patriarchs of Constantinople since the time of Sergius, and on the edicts drawn up under their influence—the Ecthesis and the Type. The pope circulated these decisions through the Western Church, and sought to obtain for them a universal adoption. He wrote also, in his own name and in the name of the synod, to the emperor Constans, sending him its proceedings, and inviting him to give his assent to the doctrines therein expressed.

Meantime Olympius, the new exarch of Ravenna, came to Rome. He was directed, in case he found himself strong enough, to publish the Type, to force all to subscribe it, and to arrest the pope if he resisted these measures; but if he found that he was not strong enough to execute these orders, he was in the first place to bring together a sufficient force to execute them with certainty. Now the case may have been that Olympius really did not feel himself strong enough at first to proceed openly against the pope, since the latter had great influence with the people, and it was feared that he might summon them to his support. On this account he may have deemed it expedient, for the present, to represent himself as more friendly to the pope than he really was, that he might prepare a trap for him under the cloak of friendship. But when, shortly afterwards, he plotted an insurrection against the emperor, he was led by his own political interests to take part

with the pope rather than against him, hoping to find some support from him in the prosecution of his political designs; so the proceedings of the Lateran council were suffered to go on without disturbance.\*

When afterwards the exarch Olympius repaired to Sicily for the purpose of engaging in the war against the Turks, where he met his death, the emperor, in 653, sent Calliopas to take his place as exarch to Italy, who was to enforce obedience to the Type, and transport Martin for punishment to Constantinople. The political interest now predominated at Constantinople, far beyond the doctrinal. He was to be

\* As in the trial instituted against Martin at Constantinople, the plan of an insurrection by Olympius is presupposed as an established fact, and Martin moreover does not deny the fact, it cannot be doubted, that Olympius entertained such designs; and this explains in the most satisfactory manner, why he made no attempt to seize the pope. And his conduct towards the pope may have occasioned, or furnished a pretext for the charge that a secret understanding existed between the two. About this connection of events, however, Anastasius, in his life of this pope, is silent; and his account seems to stand in contradiction with it. But on this ground, it would not be just to conclude that everything he relates is false; we should rather seek for some way of reconciling the two reports. It is very possible he may have followed some exaggerated story, when he says that Olympius designed to have Martin assassinated at the celebration of the eucharist at which he was present; but there may be some truth at the bottom of this story. Perhaps Olympius had determined at the outset, and before he conceived the project of an insurrection, to seize the pope by some stratagem. This view of the case seems to be confirmed by a passage in one of the pope's letters, by which we may understand his opinion of Olympius, and how far it was from any of his thoughts to make common cause with that conspirator. The letter was written to Theodore, and in it Martin reports what he had heard said by the exarch Calliopas, *quod semper per complexionem et fallacem accusationem incederent adversum nos et cum in adventu infamis Olympii vani cuiusdam hominis cum armis me hunc potuisse repellere faterentur*. On account of the word "faterentur" here, instead of "dicerent," I can understand this language in no other sense than as intended to prove the falsehood of the suspicion excited against him, as if it had been his purpose to defend himself by force. They themselves, he would say, must confess, that when Olympius first arrived, and as yet had collected no forces about him, it lay within the power of the pope, by a slight exertion of his influence, to prevent him, by force of arms, from marching into Rome. But the fact that Martin did not resort to the forcible measures which were at his command, though he might have suspected from the first that Olympius came with hostile intentions, made it perfectly evident how far it was from his thoughts to defend himself by resorting to violence.

arraigned and punished not as a heretic,\* but as a rebellious subject. What he had undertaken to do in opposition to the imperial edict, appeared to Byzantine despotism in the light of a *crimen majestatis*. In form, Martin's behaviour would certainly wear that appearance, the Type having been published as an imperial edict; and it was moreover alleged on the part of the Byzantine court, that the contents of the Type were rather of a political than of a doctrinal nature; that nothing new was established by it in matter of doctrine, but merely disputation on certain points forbidden; that no man's conscience could be injured, therefore, by this merely negative injunction. If Martin alleged, however, that the edict proceeded not so much from the emperor as from the patriarch Paul, this surely could serve in no sense to excuse his behaviour; for so might disobedience to any law be excused, on the plea that the law did not proceed from the ruler, but from the counsellor who advised him wrongly. Nevertheless, Martin, as representing the power and interest of the church—though this was not recognized on that principle of the Byzantine court which subordinated spiritual things to political—could with still more justice allege on his own side, that the civil power, in attempting to define the limits between essentials and non-essentials in doctrine, already overstepped its proper limits, and encroached on a foreign province; that the church could not be prohibited from presenting and defining that which she understood to be essentially connected with the full development of Christian doctrine. And inasmuch as he went on the principle that on him, as the successor of St. Peter, was conferred the supreme direction and guidance of the church, he might consider himself bound to defend the full development of Christian truth, and the free development of the church, against a political authority, which, as he supposed, though perhaps erroneously, was subservient to heretical influences. We must allow, however,

\* Once only, when at first it was attempted at Rome to excuse the violent measures resorted to against Martin (see ep. 14 ad Theodorum, Harduin. T. III. f. 675), a charge was brought against him on the score of doctrine, viz. that he refused to recognize the Virgin Mary as *Georónes*; which, from the Monotheletian point of view, was regarded as bordering on Nestorianism. But subsequently this accusation does not occur again, nor did it ever accord with the principles and motives of those with whom the Type originated.

that Martin, on his own hierarchical principle, would have been very willing to use the civil power as an instrument for establishing that which he himself recognized as the doctrine of orthodoxy, and no doubt would have applauded the act, if, in submission to the decisions of the Lateran council, the same emperor had issued an edict in favour of Dyothletism.

When Martin had once appeared to the imperial court in the light of a state criminal, there would be a strong inclination to believe the various political charges which were brought against him, it being no rare thing for extravagant charges of this sort to find credence with the suspicious government at Constantinople, or to be seized upon as a palliation of persecutions. Sometimes he was accused of entering into an understanding with the Turks,\* sometimes of conspiring with, and lending support to, Olympius.

On the 15th of June, 653, Calliopas arrived at Rome. He did not venture at once to take any open step against the pope, because he feared the pope would arm the people for his defence. Martin, who had been ill for several months, was lying on his couch at the altar of the Lateran church, with his clergy assembled around him. Calliopas arrived in the evening. He let Sunday pass by, because he feared the multitudes then assembled for public worship; and he sent as an excuse to the pope, that owing to the fatigue of his journey, he had not been able as yet to pay him his respects; but informed him that he would come on the next day. Early on Monday morning, the governor, still full of distrust, sent some of his followers to the pope, to tell him he was aware that armed men were collected in the church, and that stones had been piled up in heaps for the purpose of defending the pope. All this was unnecessary; the pope ought not to

\* See ep. ad Theodorum. He is said to have maintained a correspondence with the Saracens, and sent them money and a confession of faith. Were the last statement true, it would be to his honour; the just conclusion to be drawn from it was, that he took a special interest in the conversion of the Saracens; and efforts for this purpose would have tended rather to hinder than to aid any design of forming a political alliance with the Saracens. But Martin denies the whole, and affirms, that there was not a particle of truth in the story, except that he had sent money to the Christians living among the Saracens (probably in Sicily) by the hands of certain persons of their own number, who had come on a visit to Rome.

permit it. Martin caused these emissaries to be conducted through every part of the church, that they might be convinced by their own eyes that this suspicion was groundless. Calliopas, being now satisfied that he had nothing to fear, pushed forward with an armed band into the church, and published the imperial mandate, that Martin was deposed, because he had illegally obtained the bishopric,\* and that he should be conveyed to Constantinople. Several of the clergy invited the pope to call out an armed force to protect his person, since probably he could reckon, if it were but for a moment, on the zeal of the people: but Martin declared he would rather ten times die than that any man's blood should be shed on his account. He surrendered at once to the governor's force, who caused him to be conveyed to his own palace. Calliopas having at first given liberty to all ecclesiastics who pleased to go with the pope, many clergymen and also laymen who had resolved to accompany him, joined him on the next following days. But the governor had probably no other object in view than to deceive, so as to prevent an insurrection in the pope's favour. At midnight he suddenly caused him to be removed from the palace, and accompanied by only a few attendants, to be conveyed to the port. The gates of Rome were kept shut till he sailed. He was obliged to make a long and difficult voyage. He was left lying for a year on the island of Naxos. During the whole journey, the old, sick man was hardly and shamefully treated. He was denied every convenience, and the little comforts in particular which were necessary for him in his present condition of body. When ecclesiastics and laymen, at whatsoever place he came, sent him such articles as might serve for his refreshment, his keepers interfered, driving away the bearers of them with insults, and declaring that he who showed any interest in the emperor's enemy, evinced that he was an enemy of the emperor himself.† The few letters of the pope, written

\* *Quod irregulariter et sine lege episcopatum subripuisse*, which doubtless refers to the fact, that Martin had not applied in the usual manner to the emperor, and received from him the confirmation of his election; whether it was that he supposed the schisms were a sufficient reason for omitting this legal formality, or whether he had been otherwise prevented.

† See Martin's letter to Theodore, and the report of his sufferings drawn up by a friend. Harduin. III. f. 677, and what follows.

under these sufferings to his friend Theodore, manifest a spirit of Christian resignation. He began thus: "With the help of your prayers, and the prayers of all the faithful who are with you, I shall, living and dying, defend the faith on which our salvation reposes; as Paul teaches, for me to live is Christ, and to die is gain." And when, after his departure from the island of Naxos, he described to his friend the sufferings he had hitherto endured, he concluded with the following words:—"I trust in the power of God, the Omniscient, that when I shall have been removed from the present life, all my persecutors will be brought to punishment, that so at least they may be led to repentance and to turn from their wickedness." On the 17th of September, 654, he arrived at the port of Constantinople, and was left on board the ship in his sick-bed until evening, exposed to various annoyances. He was next conveyed to the prison of the chief watch, where he remained confined ninety-three days, no person being allowed to visit him. After this long delay, he was conveyed, at first on his sick-bed, before the tribunal appointed to try him. Though so weak that he could not stand without being supported, he was still required to remain standing while on trial. The president of the court said to him,—"Speak, wretched man, what wrong has the emperor done thee?" Martin made no reply. Said the president, "Art thou silent? Behold thy accusers shall now appear;" and several witnesses were now introduced, to prove that he had been concerned in the conspiracy of Olympius. As they were about to be put on their oath, the pope begged that it might not be done,—no swearing was necessary; they might do with him as they pleased: what need was there of destroying the souls of these people? When he undertook to give an account of the whole history of events in the case of Olympius, and began by saying, "When the Type had been drawn up, and was sent by the emperor to Rome,"—he was immediately interrupted, for fear he might come upon doctrines—a subject which, by special command, was to be avoided; and one of the assembly cried out,—"Don't mix in here anything about the faith, you are on trial for high-treason. We, too, are Christians and orthodox." Martin replied—"Would to God you were! But even on this point I shall testify against you, on the day of that dreadful judgment." With dignity and spirit, he

defended himself against many things which individual judges brought forward in support of the charges alleged against him. Finally he said to them,—“I adjure you by our Lord, what you conclude to do with me, do quickly ; for God knows, death is the greatest boon you can bestow on me.” The trial having been reported to the emperor, Martin, amid much shameful abuse, was stripped of his priestly robes, and conveyed in fetters to another dungeon. It seems it was the intention, at first, to condemn him to death, as guilty of high-treason ; but the patriarch Paul, then sick and nigh his end, on hearing of it, testified, notwithstanding he had been greatly injured by the popes, his dissatisfaction that a bishop should be so treated, and the emperor promised him, in his last moments, that Martin’s life should be spared. After having been left eighty-five days to pine away in the second dungeon, he was told to leave it, and remain for a few days in the house, and under the watch of one of the emperor’s secretaries, for the purpose of being transported next to his destined place of exile, which as yet was not named to him. He embraced those who were with him, and, thanking God, cheerfully bid them farewell. When they began to weep and complain, he begged them not to do so, but rather to rejoice with him, and thank God, who had judged him worthy to suffer for his sake. The town of Chersonesus, on the peninsula of Crimea, in the midst of barbarians, was selected for his place of exile. On the 26th of March, 655, he departed from Constantinople, and on the 15th of May arrived at Chersonesus. Here, in the midst of unfeeling barbarians, he had to suffer the greatest deprivations. He could obtain no bread ; he was also destitute of money to purchase it of the foreign vessels which touched at this spot. A ship came from Constantinople, and he hoped it brought means for his support which might be furnished from Rome, but he was disappointed, and in mentioning this to his friend he adds: “I also praised my God for this, since he orders our sufferings according to his wisdom.” Nevertheless, he wrote, that if the means of sustenance were not sent him he could not long survive ; “For,” said he, “the spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak, as thou thyself art aware.” He was grieved especially, that up to the month of September, he had as yet received nothing from Rome—no token of sympathy—which, perhaps, might be owing to some

#### ABANDONED BY HIS FRIENDS.

exciting the emperor's displeasure. "I wondered, and still wonder," he wrote in the month of September, "at the want of sympathy in my friends and kinsmen—that they have so utterly forgotten my misfortune, and, as I see, do not even want to know whether or not I am still on the earth." But it seemed to him the strangest of all, that the clergy of the Roman church should take no further concern about him, though a member of their own body; that they should not at least provide for his bodily wants. "For although St. Peter's church possesses no gold, yet, through the mercy of God, it has stores of grain and wine, and all things necessary for the support of life." "What fear," he writes, "has fallen on me, which restrains them from fulfilling God's commands—fear, where nothing is to be feared? Or have I appeared to the whole church so like an enemy? But may God, who will have all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth, by the mediation of St. Peter establish their hearts in the true faith, and preserve them firm and unshaken from all influences of heretics, especially their present pastors; that so, having never deviated, even in the smallest particular, from that which in the presence of the Lord and his holy angels they have published in written decrees, they may together with me receive the crown of righteousness from the hand of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. For, as it regards my feeble body, the Lord himself will take care of that, so as it may please him to order all things, whether it be under continual suffering, or with some relief. For the Lord is nigh, and why should I be troubled; for I hope in his mercy that he will soon finish my course at the goal he has ordained." His wish was fulfilled; he died on the 16th of September.

There still remained the old Maximus—he who was the head of the Dyothletians in the East, the soul of every movement both in the East and in the West against the imperial decrees; and though at the advanced age of sixty-five, still, by the influence of his name and by the firmness and stability of his character, Maximus might present a powerful resistance to the sovereign will. He was, therefore, seized, along with his disciple Anastasius, brought to Constantinople, and thrown into prison. The master and disciple, who had lived now for more than thirty years constantly together, were purposely separated. It was attempted to convict Maximus also on

#### ATTEMPTS TO INDUCE MAXIMUS TO YIELD.

political charges, without entering at all upon the subject of doctrines. Some of these accusations, on being compared with what Maximus said in his defence, show a remarkable contrast between the Byzantine and the Roman principles of church government; for example, the disciple of Maximus is accused of having refused to recognize the emperor as also a priest; and indeed he had attempted to prove, from the usage of the church, that the emperor belonged to the laity, and possessed no spiritual power. Melchisedec, to whose example the other party appealed, was, he said, at once priest and king, only as a type of Christ.\* The proceedings against Maximus, however, were not so harsh in the beginning as they had been against Martin. Respect for the old man, who was looked upon as a model of the monastic life, and compassion for his old age, operated with many who wished he might be spared; and if they could only bring him to yield, it was hoped, in this way, to overcome at once all resistance to the Type. Threats, flatteries, every mode of persuasion were tried. Maximus was told that he was not required to deny his own dogmatical convictions; but only to signify his consent to a compromise for the sake of peace. They set before him a new formulary of union, which Maximus might, no doubt, have so interpreted as to include within it his own doctrinal views—"that, in relation to the difference of the two natures, it was necessary to suppose two agencies and wills (*ἐνεργειαὶ* and *θελήσεις*); in relation to their union, one." But Maximus persisted in the views which, to maintain consistency in his doctrinal system, he believed himself bound to hold, and rejected every ambiguous concealment of the differences—which, for the reasons already stated, appeared to him important. Meantime, Martin had been wholly removed from the public arena, and Eugenius, who was substituted in his place by the exarch Calliopas,† granted to the new patriarch of Constantinople, the lately banished Pyrrhus,‡ the fellowship of the church; the Roman agents (Apocrisiarii) at Constantinople had been prevailed upon to subscribe the above-mentioned formulary of union; and as the authority of the Romish church stood high with him, it was now intended to

\* See *acta Maximi*, s. 30. T. I opp. pag. 30, and the following.

† As Calliopas would not have appointed him, unless he had pledged himself to do so beforehand. ‡ See above, p. 255.

employ it for the purpose of inducing him to yield. But the deep-seated convictions of his own mind weighed more with him than the authority of a single bishop; and he declared that though the Roman bishop had fallen from the truth, yet, according to St. Paul, even an angel from heaven could preach no other gospel. Every proposition having been rejected by him, he was sent in exile to the castle of Bizya, in Thrace, where he was kept confined apart from his disciple. But when every attempt to produce an effect on him by new negotiations had proved unavailing, the spite against the old man, whose will could not be broken, passed all bounds! In the year 662, he was dragged back again to Constantinople, publicly scourged, his tongue cut out, and his right hand severed at the wrist; after which he was banished to the country of the Lazians, where he soon died (on the 13th of August), in consequence of the injuries inflicted on him at so advanced a period of life.

Thus the emperor succeeded to enforce everywhere in the Eastern church the adoption of the Type; and with the adoption of this, the bishops of the chief cities in the East (whom the major part of the others, without any personal interest in, or independent examination of, the points in dispute, blindly followed) united, at the same time, the defence of Monotheletism. In the Roman church, on the contrary, the zeal for the doctrine of Dyotheticism continued to propagate itself; and out of all this arose a schism between the two churches, although the two next successors of Martin—Eugenius and Vitalian—from dread of the emperor's power, seem not to have taken any public stand against the patriarchs at Constantinople. But under pope Adeodatus, in 677, the schism took a more decided shape. All connection between the two patriarchs was dissolved, since the patriarchs of Constantinople, now devoted to Monotheletism, were no longer regarded in Rome as members of the Catholic church, and none of their letters were received; and the names of the Roman bishops were no longer enrolled in the church records (Diptycha) at Constantinople, and no longer mentioned in the general prayers of the church. The patriarch, Theodore of Constantinople, and Macarius of Antioch, were for expunging also the name of Vitalian from the church records. They were of the opinion that the Roman patriarchs could be justly

recognized as orthodox and as deserving to be mentioned, only as far down as Honorius, because, since his time, the dogmatic opposition had subsisted between the two churches, which needed first to be adjusted; but the then reigning emperor Constantinus Pogonatus would not suffer this. On the contrary, he was troubled by this separation of the churches; and it was his earnest wish, that the general peace of the church should once more be restored. He did not venture, being a layman, to pass any judgment himself on this difference; and therefore sought by the mutual councils of the bishops themselves, under whom the opposition existed, to bring about a safe decision. For this reason, in 678, he issued a letter to Domnus bishop of Rome, inviting him to send delegates to Constantinople, for the purpose of uniting with the patriarchs and bishops of the East in an investigation of this affair. The language of the emperor in the letter differs from the ordinary language of Byzantine despotism in such transactions, inasmuch as it evinces some respect for free doctrinal investigation. He declares, appealing to the Most High, that he would allow equal freedom to both parties and equal honour to their representatives.\* He should rejoice if the two parties could come to an agreement; but if no union could be effected, he would still send back the papal delegates with all honour to Rome. Agatho, the successor of Domnus, the latter having died soon after this letter was sent, complied with the em<sup>r</sup> ror's invitation; and in the year 680 the sixth ecumenical council assembled for the examination of this controversy at Constantinople. This therefore was the third universal council held at Constantinople, and from the vaulted room in the imperial castle where the assembly met,† it was named the Trullan council (council in Trullo). The emperor himself attended its meetings. It is true, that at this council also, there was no full and calm discussion of the disputed points; but still its proceedings were conducted in a more dignified manner, and with less disturbance from foreign influences, than had been the case in earlier councils. Conformably to the ruling principle of doctrinal tradition, the

\* His words are οὐκ ιστὶ παρ' ἡμῖν ἴστρομένους εἰδῆσσος, ἀλλ' ιστέσσας ταῖς ἀμφοτέραις φυλάξσομεν.

† Συκιετὸν τοῦ Σειον παλατίου τὸ εὖτος ἐπιλεγόμενον Τρούλλος. Vita Stephanii, ed. Muratori, p. 482, ἡ τρούλλος, ὅπις ἡμῖς ὑάτον καλοῦμεν.

standard, at this council, for the determination of disputed points, was first of all, the declarations of the older approved church-teachers, with which each party agreed, as each wanted to present only the ancient doctrine of the church. But since the older church-teachers, as we have already remarked, had written before this opposition had ever come to be discussed, and had often expressed themselves very indefinitely, hence their words might often be differently understood, being interpreted from different points of view; and one party accused the other of perverting them, or of forcing them out of their right connection and garbling them. Thus by such authorities nothing could be decided, but the dispute had to fall back upon the logical determination of conceptions; as became evident, for example, in the proceedings of the eighth session, in the case of Macarius patriarch of Antioch. The Roman delegates brought with them a letter from their bishop Agatho, which contained a full exposition and defence of Dyotheletism, with proof passages from the approved older fathers, and besides this a brief containing the same in substance, issued by this bishop in the name of a numerous synod held at Rome. These two documents were publicly read at the fourth session of the council. In the seventh session, on the 13th of February, they laid before the council a collection of passages from the older fathers (which they had also brought with them from Rome) in confirmation of that doctrine; and now the bishops George of Constantinople and Macarius of Antioch, together with the other bishops siding with them, were asked whether they agreed with the doctrine presented by the bishop of Rome. They requested leave to defer the answer of that question until the next session, that they might have time to turn to the passages cited from the fathers, and examine them in the connection in which they stood; and at the following session, on the *seventh* of March, the patriarch George declared, that having made the examination, he was convinced; and accordingly he professed the Dyotheletism set forth in those letters. Nevertheless, as it is certain that in those letters, and in the collection of authorities from the fathers laid before the council by the Roman delegates, nothing was to be found which he might not have learned from polemical writings already existing, we must either suppose he had adopted his previous Monotheletism blindly,

following the prevailing tendency, without any examination of his own, or that this change, which so suddenly took place in his views, had proceeded or was hypocritically assumed from outward considerations rather than resulted from honest conviction. Macarius, however, persisted in his Monotheletism, presenting it in a full confession of faith, together with a collection of authorities from the fathers in confirmation of his views. In being willing to confess but one will and one mode of working in Christ, he evince what was in fact hovering before his mind—the truly Christian, though in his case misapprehended, interest to derive all the volitions and acts of Christ only from the being of God in him; just as he would admit in Adam before the fall nothing but the divine will as the determining power and considered the fleshly volitions (*σαρκικὰ θελήματα*) and human reasonings (*ανθρωπίνοις λογισμοῖς*) to be a consequence of the fall.\* Men agreed in their deeper convictions, though they were divided from each other by differences of conception. To what a pitch of extravagance the fanatical zeal for such a conceptual formulary could proceed, is shown by a remarkable incident that occurred in the fifteenth session of the council. A monk from Heraclea, in Thrace, made his appearance, by name Polychronius. This person declared that a troop of persons in white robes had appeared to him, and amid them, a person of ineffable majesty, by whom, perhaps, he meant Christ himself. The latter said to him, Whosoever did not confess the one will (*ἐν θέλημα*) and the divinely human agency (*θεανθρικὴ ἴνεργεια*) was not a Christian. He must go tell the emperor that he should neither make nor adopt a new faith. The man offered to prove that this doctrine was true by a miracle, and undertook to raise a dead man to life by means of a confession of faith, drawn up in accordance with it. It was thought necessary to accede to his proposal, in order to prevent the people from being led astray by his deceptions. The whole synod and the highest officers of state, surrounded by a vast multitude of the people, made their appearance on the public square. A corpse was brought to the spot on a silver-plated bier. Polychronius laid upon it his confession of faith, and continued to whisper for an hour or two in the dead man's ear, till finally he was obliged to confess that he was unable

\* See Actio VIII. fol. 1181. T. III.

to awaken him. A shout now thundered forth from the people, pronouncing anathema on the new Simon Magus; but the external fact could not shake the deep-seated conviction in the mind of the man, and Polychronius still remained as firm in his faith as ever.

By means of this council, the doctrine of two modes of willing and working in Christ now obtained the victory in the Eastern church; and this doctrine, together with a precautionary clause against the conclusions derived from it by the Monotheletes, was established in a new symbol, "Two wills and two natural modes of working, united without schism, and without confusion, as well as without change; so that no conflict ever existed between them, but the human will was invariably subject to the divine and almighty will." The anathema was moreover pronounced on those who had hitherto defended Monotheletism, as well as on the patriarchs of Constantinople and on *Honorius*, whom however, at an earlier period, some had attempted to defend by a strained interpretation of his language.\*

But since Monotheletism, as appears evident from the above cited examples, had, both among clergy and monks, so many zealous advocates, the Monotheletian party could not be suppressed at a stroke by the anathema pronounced by this council; but it continued to propagate itself, and evinced its existence by many indications of a reaction, down from the reign of the emperor Justinian II., which began in 685.

In opposition to such attempts, the decisions of the sixth ecumenical council on the doctrine were confirmed anew by the second Trullan council, in the year 691 or 692, which was to serve as a supplement to the two preceding general councils, the fifth and the sixth.†.

\* See the eighteenth session, Harduin. III. 1398. The patriarch Georgius, and several bishops of his diocese, had petitioned: "Ινα σι τῶν Ιεροχειρονομούντων, μὴ αναβιαστοῦντος τὰ προσωτα τις τὰς ικενότες, namely, the patriarchs since Sergius, δι οικονομιαν τινὰ; but he was obliged to yield to the majority. Act. XVI. l. c. 1:386.

† Hence its name, σύνοδος πινθικτην, concilium quinisextum. As both the other councils busied themselves only with doctrinal matters, and had drawn up no canons in relation to church life and church discipline, so this council was designed to supply the deficiency; and it published 102 canons relating to matters of this sort. Several of them are important, from the fact that they served to establish in a more decided form the opposition

But in the year 711, a zealous partizan of the Monotheletians, Bardanes, or Philippicus,\* as he was called when emperor, succeeded in wresting the throne from Justinian II., who was hated on account of his remorseless despotism. Before he entered the imperial palace, he commanded that the symbol of the sixth general council of the church, which had been placed among the symbols of the other general councils, should be removed; otherwise he would not go in. He caused the names of Sergius and of Honori to be re-inserted in the diptycha, among the other orthodox patriarchs; and their images were again set up in the public places. He deposed the existing patriarch of Constantinople, and nominated in his place John, a deacon, who was ready to be used as a willing instrument in furthering the progress of Monotheletism. Under the presidency of John, a council was held at Constantinople, which overturned the decisions of the sixth general council, and drew up a new creed in favour of Monotheletism. The few clergy, who refused to accommodate themselves to the emperor's will, were deposed from their places. In Italy, on the other hand, the arm of the new emperor had no power to enforce obedience, and his attempts to introduce the new symbol into the Roman church, resulted in an insurrection of the people against his government. But this sovereignty of the Monotheletian party terminated with the short two-years reign of Philippicus, and the new emperor, Anastasius II., by whom he was dethroned, annulled all that had been done on this subject under the preceding reign. The patriarch John of Constantinople now altered his conduct at once, and stepped forth as a zealous advocate of Dyotheticism — whether in his doctrinal bent he belonged more to one party than to the other, and now or before this acted the hypocrite, he seems, at all events, to have been one

between the Greek and the Latin churches, and so to prepare the way for the schism between the two churches. Of this we shall speak again in another connection.

\* According to the report of the deacon and archivar (*Χαροφυλακός*) of the Constantinopolitan church, which is an important source of information respecting these events, published by Combes, and was appended by its author to his copy of the acts of the sixth general synod (see Harduin. *Concil. III. f. 1835*). This Philippicus had received his religious education from the abbot Stephanus, who, being a disciple of the patriarch Marcius of Antioch, defended Monotheletism at the sixth general council.

of those clergy of the court, men without character, and ready for any falsehood, who never scrupled to sacrifice every higher interest to worldly motives. He issued a letter addressed to the Roman bishop Constantine, in which, by flattering expressions of respect, he sought to gain his support, in fact addressing him—a thing which the patriarchs of Constantinople were not easily induced to do—as the head of the church, and begging him to forget the past, and to recognize in him a Christian brother. He expressed himself, in this document,\* as if he were a sincere follower of Dyothletism. He pretended, that he had been forced to take the patriarchate in order to avoid a greater evil, and to prevent the late monarch from making a layman patriarch, whom he might use as a still more effectual instrument for establishing the supremacy of Monotheletism. He endeavoured to justify his whole course of procedure under the late reign, as a necessary accommodation to circumstances (*οἰκονομία*) designed to protect pure doctrine from more violent attacks. “The pope himself—he thought—must be well aware from his own experience, that in such matters force could not be directly resisted, but resort must be had to art and cunning.† Even the prophet Nathan used concealment, for the purpose of reprobating the sins of adultery and murder in king David.”‡

John of Damascus embodied the results of these controversies, with a logical exposition of them, in his above-mentioned work on the system of faith. He also wrote a particular treatise on the same subject, and thus transmitted the polemical arguments against Monotheletism to the later Greek church.

Like Nestorianism and Monophysitism, the Monotheletic system, banished from the Roman church, could propagate itself only among an insignificant race of people independent of that church, the inhabitants of Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon, among whom this doctrine had probably been made dominant by a certain abbot Marun (Μαρῶν). After this abbot the whole tribe was named, because the abbots of this Maronite

\* The same document, first published by Combefis, is to be found in Harduin. III. f. 1838.

† Ως οὐ λίαν ἀντιτύπως καὶ σχληρῶς ἔχειν πρὸς τὴν τῆς Ἰερουσαλήμ δράγκην, τοῖς τοιούτοις ἀντι τούς τέχνην καὶ πειρασίαν καθιστάπειν εὑμαρές.

‡ Ἐλιγχος οὐκ ἀπορικάλυπτος.

convent stood in the highest consideration with them, and directed their government, as well as all their undertakings. Protected by their mountainous district, the Maronites contrived to make and keep themselves independent of the Greek empire, and afterwards of the Saracens.

We shall now proceed to consider a series of controversies, which did not relate, like those just mentioned, to the determination of individual doctrinal conceptions, but to the essential character of Christian worship — the controversies about *image-worship*. These disputes, from their very nature, would necessarily excite a far more general sympathy than those before mentioned, for the object to which they referred did not immediately occupy the attention of theologians, so that it was only by the excitement and odium produced by theologians, and then operating on the multitude, that the participation of the laity in them could be brought about; but as this subject could be understood by the laity as well as by the theologians, it would obtain the sympathy of the laity as readily as that of the clergy. The question, whether Christian worship necessarily rejected all sensible representations of religious objects, or whether such representations are indispensable to Christian feeling — this question would necessarily be answered differently by different persons, according to each one's peculiar devotional bent. One of the most zealous advocates of image-worship of whom we shall speak hereafter Theodorus Studita, makes the difference between these controversies and the preceding ones, as well as the disputes about the two natures or wills of Christ, to consist in this — that the latter related solely to notional distinctions, but the subject of the former was something sensible, outward, and lying before the eyes of all.\* And as the devotion of the multitude had a sensual tendency, so the subject of this controversy would necessarily interest them and occupy their thoughts more than any other. Furthermore, this opposition related not barely to isolated, dialectic, and notional distinctions, but opinions belonging to the

\* Οὐδὲ γὰρ πιστὸν ἐν χριστῷ φυσικῷ η θεληματικῷ καὶ ὅσα προς τούτους διμοιρίους, ἀνὴρ διαμαρτυρούσι, κατὰ τὰ νομικὰ οὖσα, οὐδὲν αἰσθητῶς παρειχεῖ την αποδεῖξιν τὸν δι εὐνοῦς νοητούς καὶ κατ' αφεμένον, το ἀμφισβητούμενον ἄτοι αισθητικόν. Theodori epistola, l. II ep. 21, in Sirmond. opp. T V f. 381.

universal tendencies of the religious spirit here met in conflict; and the victory of the one or the other of these must decide, by the consequences resulting therefrom, on the whole future development of the church and of its doctrines.

In order to explain the origin of these controversies, we must cast a glance back upon the previous history of the mode of thinking and acting in reference to this matter.

As we have shown in the preceding volumes,\* the opposition to the aesthetic religion of paganism, under which Christianity appeared, had also brought about an uncompromising opposition to all union of art with religion. But by degrees this opposition wore away; and art, particularly painting, had been used for the glorification of religion, conformably to the spirit of Christianity, which spurns nothing belonging to our pure humanity, since it was destined to appropriate, interpenetrate, and ennoble the whole of it. Although, then, the rude multitude, even in the Western church, soon allowed themselves to be misled into the error of making their worship too sensual, and of transferring the homage, due to the object represented in the symbol, to that symbol itself; and although this aberration of Christian feeling was occasioned by the culpable neglect of conveying Christian instruction to the people; yet by the church-teachers, the distinction between the right use of images to express and to excite Christian feelings, and to instruct the unlettered multitude on the one side, and the superstitious worship of images on the other, was ever held fast; and as the former was recommended, so the latter was combated with earnestness, wherever it appeared. This tendency we still observe in the Roman bishop with whom we commenced the present period. A hermit having sent to Gregory the Great for an image of Christ, and other religious symbols, the latter sent him a picture of Christ and the Virgin Mary, and pictures of St. Peter and St. Paul, and explained in the letter accompanying these presents, his views respecting the right use of images, and the way in which they were designed to subserve the interests of religion.† He expressed himself pleased with the wish avowed by the recluse, since it was evident he sought with his whole heart the Being whose image

\* Vol. I. p. 298; Vol. II. p. 251.

† L. IX. ep. 52.

he desired to have always before his eyes, that by the sight of that the love to Him might be continually revived in his heart. The striving to represent things invisible by means of the visible, was grounded in man's nature,\* but nevertheless, he considered it important to add a word of warning against that aberration of religious feeling which might lead to a superstitious worship of the image — a proof that danger was already apprehended of such a mistake in men of devotional feelings, but destitute of mental culture. "I am well aware," he wrote, "that thou desirest not the image of our Saviour, that thou mayest worship it as God, but to enkindle in thee the love of Him whose image thou wouldest see. Neither do we," he added, "prostrate ourselves before the image as before a Deity, but we adore Him whom the symbol represents to our memory as born, or suffering, or seated on the throne;† and according to the representation, the correspondent feelings of joyful elevation or of painful sympathy are excited in our breasts."

Especially worthy of notice, on this matter, is the correspondence of Gregory with Serenus, bishop of Marseilles (Massilia). The latter having observed, that among the rude Franks of his diocese, the worship of images was rapidly spreading, caused the images to be demolished, and cast out of the churches. The pope, who heard that there were complaints against this procedure of Serenus, applauded the zeal which he manifested against the worship of images,‡ but

\* Sic homo, qui alium ardenter videre desiderat, aut sponsam aman videre conatur, si contigerit eam ad balncum aut ad ecclesiam ire, statim per viam incidenti se preparat, ut de visione ejus hilaris recedat.

† Et nos quidem non quasi ante divinitatem ante illam (imaginem) prosterinmur; sed illum adoramus, quem per imaginem aut natum aut passum seu in throno sedentem recordamur. From these words it does not, indeed, necessarily appear evident, that Gregory rejected the custom of kneeling before images (the *προσκυνησις*); for the words may be easily understood as meaning that Gregory wished only to guard against a misunderstanding of that symbolical act which then already prevailed, and was approved by himself; that he wanted to show that this act was not performed with reference to the image, but to that which the image represented to the religious feelings. But he could hardly presuppose any such misunderstanding in the case of a hermit, nor imagine that he would be likely to perform his devotions to the image as such, and not refer them to Christ alone.

‡ Zelum vero, ne quid manu factum adorari possit, habuisse landavimus. As Gregory here declared himself so unconditionally against

censured his rashness in proceeding indiscriminately against all images; for these were introduced into the churches for the sake of those who could not instruct themselves by reading the Holy Scriptures, that at least by the contemplation of images they might come to some knowledge of scriptural facts.\* Serenus was not disposed to fix any such limits to his zeal against images; and whether it was that his critical judgment had become warped by his pious zeal, or that he merely sought some pretext under which he could proceed in his work of destroying images without seeming to despise the papal authority, he declared the letter of Gregory a forgery, and considered himself bound therefore to pay no further attention to its contents. It was a consequence of his well-meant, though by no means temperate or wisely directed zeal, that the minds of the rude Franks were provoked to hostility against himself. They beheld in him a destroyer of that which they held sacred; and the major part of them renounced all fellowship with him. When this came to the ears of the pope, he reprimanded Serenus† for not distinguishing the right use of images from their abuse, repeating on this occasion what he had said in his former letter, and expressing it as his opinion, that the first-mentioned use of images was important, especially for the rude nations recently converted from paganism.‡ Had he duly considered this, the pope wrote to him, he would have avoided the consequences which had followed his indiscreet zeal, and more certainly secured his object.§ He bade him take every pains to repair the injuries which had been done, and by paternal gentleness to win back the alienated affections of his people. He gave him the following instructions as to his mode of procedure for the future. “He should call together the members of the community, and prove to them by testimony from Scripture, that

the adoratio imaginum, we may infer that he rejected not merely the idolatry subsisting in that tendency of mind, but also every outward symbol of this sort, the custom of prostration and of kneeling, as usually practised before idols; and in this way we may account for his language in the last cited letter.

\* L. IX. ep. 105.

† L. XI. ep. 18.

‡ Among whom, however, the abuse might most easily creep in.

§ Si zelum discretionis condisse, sine dubio et ea, quæ intendebas, salubriter obtinere et collectum gregem non dispergere, sed potius dispersum poteras congregare.

men should pay religious worship to nothing made by human hands ; and having done this, he should explain to them in a friendly manner, that his zeal had been directed only against a practice which *contradicted* the end for which images had been introduced into the churches, but not against any use of them corresponding to that end—not against them as a means of religious instruction, where he should allow they were good."

This moderate tendency with regard to the use of images, proceeding from a genuine Christian spirit, did not long maintain itself, however, in the Roman church ; for, as appears evident from the manner in which the popes participated in the contests against images of the Latin church, they had already, down to the opening of the eighth century, become zealous defenders of image worship ; and this would, indeed, be the necessary result of that tendency fully carried out, which lay at the foundation of the whole mediæval Catholicism—a tendency which uniformly failed of duly distinguishing and separating the divine thing from the symbol designed to represent it, and was ever inclined to transfer to the latter what belonged only to the former. But in the Greek church, for reasons which have already been mentioned,\* the worship of images had made its appearance at a much earlier period, and was closely interwoven not only with ecclesiastical, but also with civil and domestic life. Not only the churches and church-books were ornamented with pictures of Christ, of the Virgin Mary, and of saints, but these objects were to be seen fronting the palaces of the emperors, and on the walls of private houses ; and even household furniture and wearing apparel were ornamented with them. The artists, among whom were many monks, emulously laboured to produce such images in wax† or more costly materials. The worship of images stood closely connected with the exaggerated reverence paid to Mary and to the saints. What relics of saints were in the Western church, such were their images in the Greek church. In every case of extremity, men prostrated themselves before the pictures of saints, many of which had the reputation of performing miraculous cures. The saints themselves being represented to the religious consciousness as pre-

\* Vol. II. p. 258.

† The *αντόχυτα*.

sent in their images, these images were introduced as sponsors at baptism, and children were named after them.\* In that uncritical age, many legends, received without a question, served to enhance the respect shown for these religious objects. Some, which were reputed not to have been by human hands (*αχειροποίητα*), stood in special veneration, and were used as the most effectual of amulets; sometimes such as were said to have been miraculously produced by Christ himself—sometimes others, of whose origin no distinct account could be given. Thus, for example, the city of Edessa possessed its famous *ancile* in the picture of Christ, sent to king Agbar, as it was pretended, by our Saviour himself; and in an *αχειροποίητος εἰκὼν τῆς Θεοτόκου* (an image of the mother of God made without hands).† Still another Christ was said to have been impressed on the handkerchief of St. Veronica (the saint healed of the issue of blood).

The extravagant lengths to which this superstitious reverence of images was carried might the more contribute to excite a reaction of the Christian consciousness against it, even among the laity, as Jews and Mohammedans accused the Christians on this score of idolatry and a transgression of the divine law; and by such reproaches many might be led to reflect on what was really required by the Christian faith in this point. To this was added, in the case of the clergy, the reading of the Bible and of the older fathers, whereby the unprejudiced would easily be led to see that the prevailing image-worship was utterly at variance with the apostolical teaching and the principles of the primitive church; and if they could not distinguish the different points of view of the Old and New Testaments, still they might believe themselves bound to apply the *Old Testament* prohibition of images to

\* Theodore Studita writes to a captain of the emperor's guard (Protospatharius), of whom he had heard, that he wore the image of St. Demetrius, as *αὐτοχθόνος*, at the baptism of his child; and he compares the confidence of faith, in which the man did this, with the confident faith of the centurion in Matth. viii. As Christ wrought the miracle then by his invisibly present divine power, although not visibly present himself, so here: *αυτῷ ὁ μηχαλόμαρτος πινύσατι τῇ οἰκίᾳ εἰκόνα τὸ βρίφος δικέρματος. ὁ μηχτός ἡδιὰ τῆς οἰκίας εἰκόνα τὸ βρίφος εἰδικέρματος οὐδὲ πινύσινεται.* Lib. I. ep. 17.

† The stories about these images are to be found in Theophylactus Simocatta, Theophanes Johannes Cantacuseenus.

*Christian worship.* But while a reaction against image-worship was thus evoked, still it was difficult to prevent it from overstepping, under the impulse of passionate excitement, the bounds of moderation. As one extreme easily leads to another, so the superstitious worship of images would easily lead to the extreme of a fanatical hatred of images and of art, and the passionate opposition would be the less productive of good fruits, the less able it was to distinguish in what it combated the true from the false, and to spare the Christian feeling and interest which lay at the bottom. It was unfortunate, too, that this reaction did not proceed, in the first place, from those whose calling it was to work upon men's convictions by teaching ; but from the possessors of secular power, and that, too, in a despotic government, where men were used to think it possible to enforce by commands, by threats, and violence, that which could never proceed but from free conviction, and where they were least capable of exercising that tenderness and indulgence which is most needed in matters touching on the religious interests of mankind. The spirit which men would drive into a way of thinking opposed to that course of development that grows out of its own essence, will but struggle the more to repel what is forced upon it against nature, and become inveterate in its errors ; for even that which is in itself true, when not imparted in that way in which alone truth can be consciously seen, but obtruded by a power different from that of the mind itself, is converted into a lie ; the subjective consciousness of truth is necessitated to resist it. So was it especially in the present case, where a medley of truth and error on the one side was opposed to a like medley on the other.

The first from whom this war against image-worship began, was the emperor Leo the Isaurian. At the very opening of his reign, with zeal for the extension of the church and of its doctrines, he also discovered the greatest ignorance with regard to the limits of the power conceded to him for this purpose. He forced Jews to receive baptism, and compelled the Montanists to come over to the dominant church. The consequence of which was, that the Jews persevered in their faith as before, and made sport of the sacred rites, in which they could be forced to join only in an outward manner ; and that the Montanists were driven to such a pitch of enthu-

## LEO THE ISAURIAN.

siasm, as to burn themselves up with their churches. Such measures led men to anticipate what they had to expect from the emperor, when he believed himself called to deliver the church from the idolatry, as it was called, of image-worship. As this idolatry of the church was seized upon as a handle for their attacks by Jews, Mohammedans, and heretics, so Leo's zeal for the extension of the church and of its faith might thus be connected with his iconoclasm. There were some, though few of them ecclesiastics, who, by the study of the Scriptures and of the older fathers, had been led to regard the introduction of images into the churches as an unchristian innovation, and in direct contradiction to the law of God. It was, probably, such persons (among whom we find particularly mentioned a certain Constantine, bishop of Nacolia, in Phrygia) who persuaded the emperor, or at least confirmed him in his own resolution, to banish images from the churches.\* The appeal to the command which forbade the use of images in the Old Testament, to the fact that they are not mentioned in the New, to passages in the old church-teachers,—all this would make an impression on the emperor; while the misfortunes of the empire, pressed hard by barbarians and unbelievers, might easily be represented to him in the light of a divine judgment on idol-worshippers. He imagined himself called, as a priest and a monarch, like Hezekiah of old, to banish an idolatry which had been spreading for centuries.

\* In the report of the presbyter John, the plenipotentiary of the oriental patriarchs, in the fifth action of the council of the image-worshippers (787, Harduin, IV. f. 319), this Constantine is described as the head of the party, and the spring of the whole movement; and it is evident from his transactions with Germanus, patriarch of Constantinople, that this was not said without reason. Of course, the zealots for image-worship, among whom also belong the Byzantine historians, hail with delight every occasion which offered itself of tracing the scheme to suppress images to the Mohammedans and the Jews. Hence their reports (savouring strongly of the fabulous) about Jews who were said to have predicted Leo's elevation to the throne of the empire, and about the influence exercised over the emperor by Beser, a renegade, which first determined him to engage in the war against images, deserve little confidence. Even were it true that Ized, a caliph, set the example for the emperor, and first commanded images to be banished from the churches of Christians in his dominions, yet it does not appear that these measures had any immediate connection with the commencement of the attack on images by the emperor Leo; though the image-worshippers were inclined to believe otherwise.

But being aware of the power of the adversary he had to contend with, he proceeded cautiously in the outset, gradually preparing his way,—exercising a prudence which was imperatively demanded by the circumstance just mentioned, rather than one resulting from any consciousness of the natural limits imposed on his authority. No doubt, the Greek emperors were wont, in their ecclesiastical projects, to apply in the first place to their patriarchs at Constantinople, and then to operate through these, as primates of the oriental church, upon the remaining multitude; but Leo could not resort to this expedient in the present case, for the monagenarian patriarch Germanus\* belonged among the most zealous advocates of image-worship, and was well versed in all the arguments used in defending it. It is true he had consented, at an earlier period, to serve as the willing instrument of an emperor, † but the defence of images touched, without doubt, his religious sympathies much more readily than the dispute concerning a logical determination of conceptions. As Leo, then, could not reckon on the consent and support of the patriarch, he believed it necessary to observe the more indulgence and caution in his first approaches towards the attack of image-worship; and his first ordinance, issued in the tenth year of his reign, in 726, was not directed against religious images in themselves, nor against every kind of reverence paid to them, but against such signs of an idolatrous homage as the custom of prostration and kneeling down before them. But since that which the emperor declared to be idolatrous was by no means acknowledged to be such by the church theologians, but was defended as a pure expression of Christian feeling, he could not well avoid a collision with them, and with his patriarch in particular; and being a layman, he would find it no easy matter to manage a man so well practised in defending this custom, which could be supported by so many nice distinctions. Although the fragmentary accounts of the historians,

\* We learn his peculiar bent of mind from his discourses in praise of the Virgin Mary, and from the pains he took to vindicate Gregory of Nyssa from the charge of Origenism.

† When bishop of Cyzicus, he had adopted the formulary introduced by Philippicus (see above, p. 271), in favour of Monotheletism. It may be, however, before this, that he was already devoted to Monotheletism; for the same bent of mind which made him a warm defender of image-worship, might also incline him to favour Monotheletism.

## ARGUMENTS OF GERMANUS.

who describe the interview between the emperor and the patriarch are in themselves entitled to but little faith—none being present at this interview but the parties—nevertheless, what they report harmonizes so well with the style in which the emperor delivers himself on this subject, in his letters still extant,\* that we may form from it some idea of what passed between the two. When the emperor appealed to the Mosaic law, which forbids the worship of graven images, or of any creature whatsoever, that patriarch met him by saying, that much depends on the connection in which a thing is spoken or done. That Mosaic law had been given to Jews accustomed to witness the worship of idols in Egypt. With Christians, the case stood otherwise. Among them, the worship of God in spirit and in truth had been established for perpetuity. Nor had Moses forbidden the use of images in religion altogether; as was evident from the example of the cherubim placed over the ark, and of other symbols in the temple. And as to himself, he said he was far from honouring images in the same sense in which we are bound to worship the triune God alone. Nor did every sort of prostration imply such worship;—even in the Old Testament this custom occurred as an outward sign of reverence; and in this sense it was observed also towards men, as at the present day men were wont, by this sign, to show respect to emperors, to their images and edicts, nor did any one see in it the least trace of idolatry. Of God's invisible essence it was, indeed, impossible to form any likeness or representation; and hence, at the position of the Old Testament, it would necessarily be forbidden to make any image of God; but now God had visibly appeared in human nature, had taken the latter into personal union with himself. As surely as we believe in the true humanity of the Son of God, so surely we must form to ourselves some image of the God-man. The representation of Christ in such an image was essentially the same as an oral confession of that great mystery of the incarnation of the Son of God, and a practical refutation of Docetism. Nor did men worship that image of Christ, which is made of earthly materials, but the worship was addressed to that which is represented by the image to the devotional mind, the incarnate Son of God.†

\* In the IV. action of the second council of Nice.

† Α προστύπωσις εχειν.

But to the mother of God, and to the saints, no devotion of any sort was paid, not even to their persons; no religious homage (*λαρεῖα*), such as belongs to God alone. To the mother of God was shown the reverence which was due to her as the person through whom humanity was made to participate in the highest blessings, and who was exalted above all other creatures. And in the saints, men worshipped only what the grace of God had wrought in human nature, and paid them in their images nothing more than the reverence and love which were due to such distinguished fellow-servants and fellow-soldiers. In the image we do not invoke the saint, but the God of the saint.\* It is plain, how important to the old patriarch the theory of images, taken in this connection of ideas, must have seemed; since, in his view, it was intimately connected with the recognition of the reality of the fact of the divine incarnation. Accordingly, he declared that he was ready to give up his life for the image of that being who had given up his own life to restore the fallen image of God in human nature. The emperor must have perceived that he could not possibly come to any agreement with the patriarch, who had already pushed his way so far into this artfully combined system. In the opinion that no sort of idolatrous worship of images was admissible both were agreed; but the notion itself they explained differently. The emperor declared he had nothing to object against images in themselves; but that he only wanted to raise some of them, which were objects of peculiar veneration to the people, to a higher place, beyond contact of the multitude, which exposed them to be dis- honoured. It was manifestly his design to deceive the old patriarch, and, without his participation, to prepare the way, step by step, for the execution of his project. Those bishops who had a common understanding with the emperor, began, in the meantime, to proceed against the images in their dioceses; and as the people and the major part of the clergy were zealously devoted to image-worship, this attempt could not fail to be attended with many violent outbreaks, so that the patriarch was obliged to complain, that in whole cities, and among large portions of the people, great disturbances had grown out of

\* The words of Germanus, in his letter to Thomas, bishop of Claudiopolis: *προσβλίπων γάρ τις μετ' επιστήμης εἰκόνι τινὶ τῶν ἁγίων, οὐ τὸ σῖδες δόξα σοι ὁ θεὸς, λίγισι τοῦ ἁγίου τὸ σῖδεμα προστίθει.* Harduin. IV. f. 258.

## OUTBREAK OF THE CONTROVERSY.

these proceedings.\* Complaints against such bishops flowed in upon him from many quarters. The most considerable man of that party, Constantine, bishop of Nacolia in Phrygia, who had fallen into a quarrel with his metropolitan, John, bishop of Synnada, came himself to Constantinople. He assured the patriarch, that it was far from his intention to insult Christ and the saints in their images; that his object was directed only against the idolatrous worship of images forbidden by the divine law. Now, in the condemnation of such a practice, the patriarch agreed with him; and explained at large, in the way above stated, how different a thing the reverence paid to images was from adoration. The bishop perceiving, no doubt, that it would here be useless to contend, seemed to approve all that was said, and promised the patriarch that he would avoid every procedure which might give offence, or prove an occasion of disturbance among the people. Germanus gave him a letter to the metropolitan John, in which he informed the latter of the happy result of these negotiations; but the bishop Constantine withheld the letter from its destination, and probably concerned himself no further about the matter as it had then been discussed. Similar accounts reached the ear of the patriarch respecting other adjacent districts, as Paphlagonia, where Thomas, bishop of Claudiopolis, laboured to suppress the worship of images. He sent to the same an elaborate document in defence of images, and of the reverence paid them in the way that was customary at that time.† In this letter he adduced, as an argument in their favour, the miracles said to have been wrought by them; such as the healing of diseases (in proof of which he could appeal to his own personal experience), and the fact that such effects were produced only by images of Christ and the saints, and not by any others; so that they could not be attributed to an accidental

\* The words of the patriarch Germanus, IV. f. 259: πόλις ὅλαι καὶ τὰ πλήθη τῶν λαῶν σὺν ἐδίγνω τις τούτου θεούβωτος τυγχάνουσιν.

† Germanus defends, in this tract, the custom also of placing lights and burning incense before the images of saints, which the opponents of image-worship probably represented as being a heathen practice. He seeks to justify this by the symbolism, which had become so customary since the dissemination of the writings falsely ascribed to Dionysius: σύμβολον μὲν τὰ αἰσθητὰ φάτα τῆς ἀγλοῦ καὶ θεᾶς φωτεόσις, ἡ δὲ τῶν ἀφροδιτῶν ἀναθυμίασις; τῆς ἀκραφιοῦς καὶ ὅλης τοῦ ἀγίου τυγχάνεται περιστολας τε καὶ πληρώσεις.

coincidence.\* He appealed in particular to a miracle at Sōzopolis, in Pisidia, where balsam had distilled from the painted hand of an image of Mary. To be sure, this was *no longer the fact*; but still there were many witnesses of the wonder, and they who were disposed to call it in question because it no longer took place, might, for the same reason, doubt the miracles recorded in the Acts, which were no longer performed. At that time, the patriarch still thought the images of the apostles and prophets, erected before the imperial palace, might be rightly regarded as evidencing the piety of the emperor.

These first covert attacks on image-worship created nevertheless so great a sensation, that the accounts of them penetrating beyond the existing boundaries of the Roman empire into Palestine, then under the dominion of the Saracens, spread dismay among the zealots for the old church doctrines. Living at that time in Damascus was that zealous and acute-minded defender of the church doctrine, John, † whom we have already mentioned. He filled a civil post of considerable importance under the Caliphs who ruled in these districts; but some years after retired as a monk to the Saba convent near Jerusalem. This person supposed that, in the attack upon images, he saw a tendency of spirit dangerous to the essence of Christianity, and felt constrained to address a discourse in defence of image-worship, ‡ and against the arguments of its

\* Which may be easily explained; the contemplation of other images would not produce the same subjective impressions.

† His father Sergius, called by the Saracens Mansur, had been intrusted by the caliph with an important civil office. If we may credit the more lately composed and fabulous life of John of Damascus, it was owing to a peculiar turn of events that he was enabled to enjoy the advantages of a distinguished literary education. Among the many Christians whom the Arabians had carried off as captives in marauding expeditions along the sea-coast of the West, was a certain Cosmas, a man of Greek descent, probably from Calabria. John's father obtained for this person his liberty, took him home, and intrusted him with the education of his own son, and also of an adopted one, who afterwards became famous as a writer of spiritual songs (*Κοσμᾶς ὁ μιλῶντος*), and was made bishop of Majuma in Palestine.

‡ Nothing is to be found inconsistent with this in the fact that John (who was in the habit, as appears above, of associating image-worship, according to his own understanding of it, with the essential peculiarities of the Christian faith, and who moreover shows himself, in his defence of it, to have been a man of sound judgment and reflection) that this

JOHN OF DAMASCUS A FRIEND TO IMAGES.

antagonists, to the patriarchs and the communities in Constantinople, while still a hope might be indulged, that the emperor, by perceiving its inconsistency, might be induced to change his policy, in which hope the defenders of images refrained as yet from everything which could offend the emperor, although John himself had no occasion to fear him. He merely hinted that earthly rulers were themselves subject to a higher Potentate, and that the laws should govern princes. He saw in that dread of idolatry, which had led to the attacking of images, a decline from the Christian fulness of age and perfection, a falling back into the nonage of the Jewish position. To those who were ever repeating that command of the Old Testament which forbids representations of God, Exod. xx., he applied the words of Paul: The letter killeth, the spirit maketh alive. "Christians," said he, "who have arrived at the full age in religion, are endowed with a faculty of distinguishing that which can be symbolized, and that which transcends the power of symbolization. On the standing-ground of the Old Testament, God, as incorporeal and formless, could not, indeed, be represented under any image whatsoever; but now, after God has appeared in the flesh, and walked with men on the earth, I represent him, according to his visible appearance, in an image. I adore not the earthly material, but its Creator, who for my sake vouchsafed to dwell in an earthly tabernacle, and who by the earthly material

John combated the popular tales concerning dragons and fairies (*στρύγγα, γιγλαδίς*), as appears from some fragments of his on this subject, published by Le Quien, Tom. I. opp. f. 471. We see no good reason why a defender of image-worship might not at the same time set himself to oppose that species of superstition. His conduct, in both cases alike, proceeded from religious motives. Image-worship, by virtue of the connection of ideas unfolded in the text, appears to him a practice altogether correspondent with the spirit of Christianity, and conformable to reason; but these stories he regarded as alike repugnant to Christian truth and to reason. He ascribes the spread of the latter superstition among the people to the fact that they were kept in such total ignorance of the Scriptures. He insists that laymen of all classes, even soldiers and peasants, ought to read the sacred word, *μέμρατα γαρ βλαστόμετα ίε τοῦ μη αναγνώσσειν τὰς ιερὰς βιβλίους καὶ ἐρυθράς αὐτάς κατά τὸν τοῦ κυρίου λόγον.* "Αλλ' ὁ μην στρατιώτης λέγει, ὅτι στρατιώτης εἰρὶ καὶ σὺ Χριστὸς ἔχεις αναγνώσσειν, ὁ δὲ γινεργὸς τὴν γιανουρικὴν περιφασίζεται. This biblical tendency might seem rather to collide with the traditional one of a zealous image-worshipper; but neither are these contrarieties of such a nature that they might not exist together in the same individual.

wrought out my salvation. I never will cease honouring the earthly material by means of which my salvation has been effected. Joshua commanded the Jews, to take twelve stones from the river Jordan (Joshua iv.), and he gave as a reason: When your children ask their fathers in time to come, saying, What mean ye by these stones? Then ye shall answer them, that the waters of Jordan were cut off before the ark of the covenant of the Lord, and the ark and the whole people passed through. Why may not we, then, form a picture of the sufferings by which the salvation of the world was procured, and of the miracles of Christ; so that when my son asks me, What is this? I may tell him God became man, and by him, not Israel alone passed over Jordan, but all human nature was led back to the original bliss: —by him, that nature has been raised from the low places of the earth above all principalities and powers, and to the throne of the Father himself. But if men are willing to tolerate images of Christ and of Mary, but not of any others, then it is not images they are combating, but the worship of the saints. You tolerate images of Christ because he is glorified; but not images of saints, because you do not acknowledge that they are glorified. You do not acknowledge the dignity imparted to human nature by the Son of God, who has indeed glorified them, and exalted them to fellowship with God. Were images representing the forms of animals and plants employed to adorn the temple? and is it not now a far more glorious thing to have all the walls of God's house decorated with the images of those who were themselves living temples of God, full of the Holy Ghost? Why should not the saints who have shared in the sufferings of Christ share also, as his friends, even here upon earth, in his glory? He calls them no longer his servants, but his friends." On the Christian festival which celebrated the memory of the saints, John of Damascus noticed a fundamental mark of distinction between the Christian and the Jewish customs. " In the times of the ancient covenant, no temple was ever named after a man. The death of the righteous was lamented, not celebrated. The touch of a dead body was defiling. But now it is otherwise, since human nature by the appearance of the Son of God in it, and by his sufferings for it, has been delivered from the dominion of sin and death, and exalted to worship with God and to be partakers of the divine life.

Either then you must go further, and annul the jubilees of the saints which are celebrated in contrariety to the ancient law, or tolerate also the images, which as you say are contrary to the ancient law." In general, he discovers in the enemies of images, a tendency bordering on Judaism, or indeed on Manichæism, which threatened to introduce again the antagonism between the divine and human removed by the redemption, and which ran counter to Christian realism. If, to the enemies of the images, it appeared a desecration of holy things to attempt representing them by earthly materials ; to John, on the other hand, the earthly material appeared worthy of all honour, inasmuch as through it, as the instrument and medium of the divine agency and grace, is wrought the salvation of man. " Is not the wood of the cross earthly material ? " He then goes on to mention all holy places, and the body and blood of the Lord. " Insult not the earthly material—nothing that God has created is, in itself, a thing to be despised. To say this is Manichaean—the abuse of sin alone is a thing to be contemned."

Meantime, while these disputes were producing, in many districts, a ferment in the popular mind, the appearance of extraordinary natural phenomena, among others an earthquake, was looked upon by the discontented as a token of the divine displeasure against the enemies of images. The inhabitants of the islands called the Cyclades rebelled, under a certain Stephanus as their leader. But by means of the Greek fire the emperor succeeded in destroying their fleet ; and regarding this victory as a proof that God favoured his proceedings against the idolaters, he was confirmed in his iconoclasm. In vain he endeavoured to gain over the old patriarch to his views ; the latter persisted stoutly in his opposition, and declared that without a general council no change could be attempted in the church. The emperor now, without consulting with him, but after having discussed the whole matter with his civil counsellors, issued, in the year 730, an ordinance, whereby *all images* for religious purposes were forbidden. Germanus, resolved not to act in contradiction to his conscience, voluntarily resigned his office, and retired once more to a life of solitude ; and his secretary,\* Anastasius, who was willing to

\* Σύντιτλος, a subordinate who always possessed much influence with the patriarch.

act as the emperor's tool, obtained his place. Conformably to the usual policy, the bishops generally, who declined receiving the imperial edict, were now ejected from their places.\* When the report of these measures reached Syria and Palestine, John of Damascus composed, in defence of images, a second treatise, in which he more fully unfolded the arguments contained in the first.† In this he spoke still more sharply against the emperor. "It does not belong to the monarch," says he, "to give laws to the church. The apostle Paul does not mention among the offices instituted by God (1 Cor. xii.), for advancing the growth of the churches, the office of monarch. Not monarchs, but apostles, prophets, pastors, and teachers, preached the divine word. Emperors had to provide for the welfare of the state; pastors and teachers for the growth of the church."‡ He speaks of a new gospel of Leo; but though he had nothing to fear from the emperor, still he pronounced against him no anathemas; but applying the words of St. Paul (Gal. i. 8), he said, "Though an angel, though an emperor, preach to you any other gospel than ye have received, shut your ears; for I still forbear to say with the apostle, let him be accursed, because I hope for his reformation." In the third discourse he endeavours to point out the need of such sensuous representations, grounded in the essence of human nature, and of the Christian consciousness. "Our Lord pronounces his disciples blessed because their eyes could see and their ears hear such things. The apostles saw Christ with their bodily eyes, his sufferings and his miraculous works; and they heard his words. We, too, long to see, to hear, and to be pronounced blessed. But as now, when he is not bodily present, we hear his words by means of books, and show our reverence for these books,§ so by means of images we behold the

\* See Joh. Damasc. Orat. II. s. 12.

† He himself says, that he had been invited to do so, διὰ τὸ μὴ πάντα σύδιαγνωστὸν τοῖς πολλοῖς τὸ πρῶτον λόγον εἶναι.

‡ Βασιλίου ἴστιν ἡ πολιτικὴ εὐπρεψία, ἡ δὲ ἐκκλησιαστικὴ κατάστασις παριστανει καὶ διδασκάλων.

§ Προσκ νοῦμεν, τιμῶντες τὰς βιβλους, διὸ ἡν ἀκούομεν τῶν λόγων αὐτοῦ. The image-worshippers frequently argued, that it was customary to pay to the gospels (when they were publicly read in the churches) and to the cross, the symbol representing the body and blood of our Lord, the homage of prostration (*προσκύνησις*)—why then might it not be paid also to the images?

#### CHURCH FELLOWSHIP BROKEN UP.

semblance of his bodily form, his miracles, and his sufferings, and we are thereby sanctified, filled with confidence and joy. But while we behold the bodily shape we think also as much as is possible on the majesty of his godhead; for since we are of a twofold nature, not barely spiritual, but consisting of body and spirit, we can only attain to the spiritual by means of the corporeal. In like manner, therefore, as we hear by sensible words with the bodily ears, and at the same time think that which is spiritual, so we attain through sensuous intuitions to spiritual ones. So also Christ took upon him body and soul, because man consists of both; and thus everything—baptism, the Lord's supper, prayer, singing, lights, incense, is twofold, at once spiritual and corporeal." If the enemies of images alleged that no instance of their employment could be pointed out in the New Testament, John of Damascus could reply that many other things also, as the doctrine of the Trinity, of likeness of essence, of the two natures of Christ, had been deduced from the Scriptures, not being contained in them in so many words; and he could appeal to tradition as a source of religious knowledge, from which even the enemies of images derived many doctrines, which could not be proved from Scripture.

In these discourses, then, John of Damascus pronounces, as yet, no anathema on the emperor; the hope being still entertained that there would be a change in his conduct, at present so hostile to the reigning spirit of the church. But when he now began to execute with energy the edict against images, the anathema was pronounced in all those churches which the arm of Byzantine power could not reach, on the enemies of the images; they renounced all fellowship with the latter, and constituted from this time forward the chief support and dependence of the persecuted and banished image-worshippers.

To these churches, in which the emperor's power could safely be defied, belonged not solely those of the East, where Mohammedan princes ruled; the Roman church also found itself placed in the same relation, for while the popes did indeed recognize the East-Roman emperors as their masters, and their own political interests would lead them to prefer annexation to a power at a distance rather than to the Longobards near by, still, under the existing political relations they might safely bid defiance to the emperor's threats. In a time when Boniface was labouring with such mighty effect,

as an instrument for the triumph of papacy ; when so many rude populations acknowledged, along with Christianity, the papal authority ; it was in such a time that pope Gregory II.,\* fully conscious of his rising influence among the nations of the West, replied to the emperor's threatening language in a tone so sarcastic that unless we transport ourselves back, and enter into the very spirit of the period, it might seem incredible to us that a pope should have so expressed himself in addressing an emperor. "But once try the experiment," he writes to him ; "go into the schools where the children are learning to read and write, and tell them you are the persecutor of the images ; they would instantly throw their tablets at your head, and the ignorant would teach you perforce what you would not learn from the wise." The emperor had said in his letter to the pope, "As Uzziah,† after a period of eight hundred years, banished the brazen serpents out of the temple, so I, after eight hundred years, have banished the idolatrous images from the church."‡ The pope replied, himself also

\* In or after the year 730.

† That is, Hezekiah ;—either the emperor may have been first to confound Uzziah with Hezekiah, or perhaps this error proceeded solely from the pope.

‡ These words, like many other singular things in this letter, which fully corresponds, we must allow, with the character of the times and of the pope, might lead us to suspect its genuineness, or at least its genuineness as a whole, unless we suppose an error has slipped in with regard to the number of years, which in fact does not correspond to the period intervening between the erection of the brazen serpent and the times either of Uzziah or Hezekiah : for how could Leo wish to say that he had banished images from the churches after a period of eight hundred years ? However badly he may have reckoned, or extravagantly he may have expressed himself, still it would follow that the superstition of image-worship had begun even in the times of the apostles. But to utter a falsehood on this point, the enemy of images certainly had no conceivable motive ; on the contrary, it must have seemed important to him to show that image-worship was a thing of very recent date ; and we know that the iconoclasts did in fact so affirm, and indeed they could bring many proofs in support of this assertion from the older church fathers : Leo, therefore, could never have so expressed himself. But of the author of this letter, it is very possible to suppose that he perverted the emperor's language. Perhaps the emperor may have said, in his letter, against those who defended images on the authority of tradition, that even though images had been in the churches for eight hundred years, he was still right in banishing them from the churches, as an appurtenance of idolatry, as Hezekiah had done in the case of the brazen serpent.

## GREGORY'S SECOND LETTER.

confounding Uzziah with Hezekiah, whether by his own fault, or because the emperor had done the same, "Yes, indeed, Uzziah was your brother, and dealt with the priests of his time after the same tyrannical manner as you deal with them now." He assured him it had been his intention to exercise the power he had received from St. Peter, and pronounce on him the sentence of condemnation, if the emperor had not already virtually pronounced the curse on himself. "Better were it," says he, "if one alternative were necessary, that the emperor should be called a heretic than a persecutor and destroyer of the images; for they that teach errors in doctrine still find some excuse for themselves in the obscurity of subjects; but you have openly persecuted objects which are as manifest as the light, and robbed the church of God of its ornamental attire." He defended the worshippers of images against the reproach of idolatry, which the emperor had cast upon them. Far was it from any thought of theirs to place their trust in images. "If it is an image of our Lord," he writes, "then we say Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God, help us, and deliver us. If it is an image of his holy Mother we say, Holy Mother of God, entreat thy Son for us, our true God, that he may deliver our souls. If it is an image of a martyr, e. g. St. Stephen, we say Holy Stephen, that ~~who~~ hast shed thy blood for the sake of Christ, thou ~~who~~ first martyr, hast confidence, pray for us." He gave the emperor to understand that he had no reason to ~~fear his fleet~~, for he needed but to remove twenty-four stadia from Rome in order to be safe, and to give himself no further concern about the emperor's power.

The emperor, in a letter to the pope, having said in justification of his conduct that he was both king and priest at the same time, Gregory, in a second letter replied: This epithet his predecessors, Constantine and Justinian, might with more propriety have adopted, since they had upheld the priests in defending the true faith. Next he pointed out to him the great difference between royalty and priesthood. "If a man commits an offence against the emperor, his goods are confiscated, he is condemned to death, or banished far from his friends. The priests proceed in a very different way from this. When a man confesses his sins to them they banish him to a place where he must do church penance; they compel him to

fast, to watch, and pray ; and, having made him suffer in right earnest, they give him the body and blood of our Lord, and bring him back to the Lord pure and guiltless." The emperor again had said in his letter that in the six general councils images are not mentioned. To this Gregory replied : " Neither is anything said about bread and water, eating and not eating ; these things being always connected with human life. So images have ever been handed down by tradition ; the bishops themselves brought their images with them to the councils, for no good man ever undertook a journey without one. " Men," he writes, " expended their estates to have the sacred stories represented in paintings. Husbands and wives took their children by the hand, others led the youth, and strangers from pagan nations, to these paintings, where they could point out to them the sacred stories with the finger, and so edify them as to lift their hearts and minds to God ; but you hinder the poor people from doing all this, and teach them, on the contrary, to find their amusements in harp-playing and flute-playing, in carousals and buffoonery."

The emperor, it is true, strove earnestly to carry his edict against images into full effect ; but owing to the vast number and wide diffusion of these objects, and the manner in which image-worship was interwoven, not merely with church but with domestic life, this would prove to be no easy task, even for Byantine despotism, with all its disregard for the rights of individuals. The attempt would naturally be made first to remove the images from all public places, and from the churches. And here they would of course make the first onset upon those images which stood in highest consideration with the people—those about which various wonderful stories were related, and the very sight of which served to nourish and promote the reverence of images. But the removal of such monuments would be likely to excite violent commotions among the people, who saw they were going to be deprived of the objects of their devotion. For instance, over the bronze portal of the imperial palace\* stood a magnificent image of Christ,† which was regarded with universal reverence. A

\* Which was known, therefore, under the name of the *άγια χαλκη*.

† This image of Christ was known under the name of *χρυστός ἡ αντίθετης = τρόπος*, the surety. This epithet might lead us to conclude that it

soldier of the emperor's guard placed up a ladder for the purpose of taking down the image and burning it, when a collection of women gathered round, and begged that the image might be spared to them; but instead of attending to their requests and representations, the soldier struck his axe into the face of the image, thus wounding to the quick the pious sensibilities of the women, who looked upon the act as an insult done to the Saviour. Maddened with indignation, they drew the ladder from under the soldier's feet, who, coming to the ground, fell a victim to their fanatical rage. The emperor now despatched more soldiers to the spot, who quelled the tumult by force, and carried off the image.\* In place of this image of Christ he ordered a cross to be set up in the same niche, with a remarkable inscription, which was composed by one Stephen, a member of this faction, and serves to show the fanatical hatred of images and of art which characterized the whole party. "The emperor could not suffer a dumb and lifeless figure, of earthly materials, smeared over with paint,

had derived its origin from some special event. According to an old legend it was the following: Theodore, a wealthy merchant and ship-owner of Constantinople, had lost all his property at sea. Struggling in vain to amass capital enough for new commercial speculations, he besought himself to a rich Jew, named Abraham. The latter, after much entreaty, agreed to lend him a considerable sum, provided he could furnish him with sufficient security; but Theodore, not being able to find any, had recourse at last to an image of Christ, before which he was accustomed to pay his devotions. This image he boldly offered as his surety, and the Jew, moved by compassion for Theodore, as well as strongly impressed by the confidence of his faith, agreed to accept it. After the loss of two more vessels at sea, Theodore at last prospered in his trade, became rich again, and was enabled to pay back Abraham the whole he had borrowed. This with various accompanying marvels, made such an impression on the latter, that he had himself and his family baptized, and afterwards became a presbyter. Theodore turned monk, as he had resolved to do after he met with his first loss at sea. These incidents, which are said to have happened under the emperor Heraclius, are related in a panegyric on the image in question, which Combeffis has published in his hist. Monothélet. or Auct. bibl. patr. Paris. T. II. 1648.

\* See the story in the life of the image-worshipper Stephen, in the *Analecta Græca*, published by the Maurinian Benedictines (T. I. p. 415); and the more recent one in the above cited tract of Gregory II., who had heard it told by Western pilgrims of various countries returning from Constantinople, who had been eye-witnesses of the facts. See Harduin. *Concil. IV. f. 11.*

to stand as a representation of Christ. He has therefore erected here the sign of the cross, a glory to the gate of believing princes.”\* This inscription involves, to be sure—as did all the proceedings of the iconoclasts—an inconsistency and a self-contradiction.† The same principle by which the earthly material was deemed unworthy of being employed to represent sacred things, might also be applied to the cross; and the same principle by which the ceremony of prostration before images was declared an act of idolatry, should have led them also to reject the similar reverence shown to the symbol of the cross, against which, however, nothing was directly said. The sign of the cross ought to have been abolished, so as not to afford a foothold for such superstitious customs. But in favour of the cross it might be said that it was not, like the images, a work of art; and the iconoclasts generally had not come to any clear and distinct consciousness of the principle which actuated them. As this could be developed only in conflict with a different direction of feeling, given them by education and tradition, many inward contradictions would still present themselves in their sentiments and conduct.

Through a period of twelve years the emperor Leo laboured in vain to subdue a tendency of the religious spirit which was so deeply rooted; and after the death of Leo, a reaction, probably from the same cause, arose, which resulted in important political consequences. His son, Constantine Copronymus, as zealous an iconoclast as his father, having succeeded him in the government in 741, advantage was taken of the hostility of the people to the iconoclasts by Artabasdus, the brother-in-law of Copronymus, who obtained possession of the throne, and restored the worship of images. Constantine, however, succeeded in wresting the kingdom again out of his hands, and in 744 became once more master of the empire. He resolved

“Αφανος οδος, και πνοης ιερομίνον,  
Χριστος γραφισθαι μη φέρων ο διεπότης  
“Την γινεσχοτεις γραφαις πατουμίνη,  
Διών σὺν νιῇ τῷ νιῷ Κανονανίνη  
Σταυροῦ χαζάτται τὸν τρισόλβιον τύπον,  
Καύχημα πιστῶν ο πύλαις ανακτόρων.

See Banduri, I. f. 125, and Theod. Studit. opp. ed. Sirmond. f. 136,

† This is made prominent by Theodore Studita in his *Antirrheticus* against the epigrams of the iconoclasts.

## GENERAL COUNCIL CONVOKED.

utterly to exterminate the images, and finish the work begun by his father. But the sad experiences of the early part of his reign had taught him the necessity of proceeding with slow and cautious steps, if he did not mean to ruin the whole project; and besides, on his reaccession to the throne, other unfavourable circumstances occurred, which counselled him to prudence. An earthquake, a desolating pestilence, took place—calamities which agitated the popular mind, and which might easily be turned to advantage by the image-worshippers, who had the people on their side. Moreover, the disturbances which followed his first attempts against the images taught him afresh the necessity of more thorough measures to change the tone of popular feeling; and, after mature deliberation with his counsellors, he concluded that the surest means for effecting his object would be to convoke a general council, which might take its place by the side of the older general councils, and lend a sacred authority for ever to the principles of the iconoclasts. In the year 754 such a council was appointed to assemble at Constantinople. It was composed of three hundred and thirty-eight bishops. Among these there were probably but few (and at the head of them stood Theodosius, bishop of ~~Emesa~~) who, from well-grounded conviction, were zealous and decided iconoclasts. The rest were partly such as had been determined in their course by the influence of these first, and hence might afterwards easily be turned back again by influence of another sort; and partly such as had ever been ~~wont~~ to attach themselves to the court-party. To the fanatical zeal of image-worship this council opposed a no less fanatical hatred of images and of art. The disposition of the image-worshippers to brand their opponents as heretics, not on the ground of the doctrines they avowed, but on the ground of their own inferences from those doctrines, was met by another, equally bad, on the opposite side. With great injustice the council declared the image-worshippers to be men who had sunk back again into the idolatry which Christianity had banished. The devil had covertly re-introduced idolatry under the outward form of Christianity; had induced his servants to worship a creature designated by the name of Christ, as God; and yet the friends of images had taken special pains to guard, by careful distinctions, against such accusations. In the next place it was asserted, in the spirit of the Byzantine court, which was ever

confounding spiritual things with political, that as Christ once sent forth his apostles, armed with the power of the Holy Ghost, to destroy all idolatry, so at the present time he had inspired the emperor to come forth in emulation of the apostles, for the advancement and instruction of the church,\* to destroy the works of the devil. While the image-worshippers accused their opponents of denying the reality of Christ's incarnation, in refusing to acknowledge the images of Christ, so this council descended to accusations of a similar character against the image-worshippers. If they believed they could make an image of Christ, then, inasmuch as the divine essence was incapable of being represented under the limited forms of sense, they must believe that, by the union of deity and humanity, a change took place of both divine and human attributes, and that a *tertium quid* had resulted from this union, capable of being represented by art; and thus they fell into Eutychianism; or they must believe that the humanity had a self-subsistent existence of its own, and in this respect was capable of being represented; and thus they fell into Nestorianism. "What a grievous mistake of the wretched painter," exclaims the synod, "to think of representing with his profane hand that which is believed with the heart, and of which confession is made by the mouth! There is but one true image or symbol, even that which Christ himself made of his incarnation, when, just before his passion, he appointed bread and wine to be the symbol of his body and blood. Her consecration by the priest was the intermediate instrument by which the earthly material of bread was raised to that higher dignity. This true symbol, instituted by Christ himself, answered to the natural body of Christ; since, like the latter, it served as a bearer of the divine essence. (Thus it appears that the bread and wine, interpenetrated by virtue of the consecration with the divine life flowing from Christ, became a channel for the communication of this life, and for the sanctification of those who partook of it.) On the contrary, the images, so called, derived their origin neither from any tradition from Christ, from the apostles, or from the fathers, nor were they consecrated by holy prayer, so as to be transferred from a profane to a holy use; but such an image still

\* Πρὸς καταρτισμὸν ἡμῶν καὶ διδασκαλίαν, so say the bishops of the emperor.

continued to be profane, continued to be what the painter made it, since nothing had invested it with higher dignity."

But in the next place, aside from these reasons, which were urged exclusively against images of Christ, the images of saints, and of the Virgin Mary, were especially rejected, as having grown out of paganism, and as being altogether alien from Christianity. For, as paganism was wanting in the hope of a resurrection, it had hit upon the fancy worthy of itself, of attempting, by a mockery of this sort, to represent the absent as present.\* Far should it be from the Christian church to follow this invention of men who were under the guidance and actuation of evil spirits.† Whoever undertook to represent the saints dwelling with God in eternity, by that dead and accursed art foolishly invented by pagans, was guilty of blaspheming them. The art of the painter is here described as an altogether pagan device; and hence Christians must be forbidden to borrow, from what was so foreign from their faith, any testimony in favour of that faith; just as Christ himself refused the testimony of demons, commanding them to be silent. The worship of God in spirit and in truth is set over against the use of images; as, also, what St. Paul says (2 Cor. v. 16), "Though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more;" and what he says touching the opposition between faith and open vision (1 Cor. xiii.) Furthermore, extracts from the older fathers, expressing opposition to images, were read before the synod; nor would genuine testimonies of this sort be wanting in Christian antiquity. At the same time, a great deal which is conceived wholly in the spirit and tone of the iconoclasts of this age, may have been either interpolated by them, or else falsified so as to answer their purpose. Such deception to promote the honour of God, and advance the truth would, on their principle, be considered perfectly allowable.‡ Accordingly, it was

\* Ἐλπίδα γὰρ αναστάσιας μὴ ἔχων (οὐ ἀληνομός) ἀξιον ιαυτοῦ παιγνιον συντοπτεῖται, ἵνα τὰ μὲν πάροντα ὡς πάροντα διὰ τῆς χλίνης παραστῆση.

† Διηγονοφόρων ἀνδραν οὐρανα.

‡ Many bishops, who had attended this council, and who referred back to it at the second council of Nice, here declared, that they had been deceived at the former, by passages from the older church fathers, torn from their connection and falsely quoted. It was purposely contrived, they said, that the works of the fathers themselves should not be placed before them, but only isolated extracts. The declaration of two of those

now settled that every image, of whatsoever material, produced by the wretched art of painting, should be banished from the Christian church.\* No person henceforth should be allowed to follow so godless an art. Whoever for the future should presume to manufacture such an image, to worship it, to place it up, or conceal it, in a church or a private dwelling, should, if an ecclesiastic, be deposed; if a monk or layman, be expelled from the communion of the church, and otherwise punished, according to the imperial laws.

The synod must no doubt have learned, that the zeal against the idolatrous worship of images had misled many to destroy such vessels and furniture of the churches as happened to be ornamented with figures of religious objects, and for the same reason to attack the churches themselves; or even that covetousness had done the same thing under similar pretexts. The synod itself confesses, that such disorders had occurred.† And it may therefore be believed, though coming as it does from the mouth of a zealous defender of image-worship it is the less deserving of credence,‡—that a certain bishop was accused before this ecclesiastical assembly of having trodden under foot a sacramental cup, because it was ornamented with figures of Christ and the Virgin Mary. And it may undoubtedly be true, as the story relates, that the passionate proceeding of this bishop was pardoned on the score of his zeal for the honour of God; while his accusers were excommunicated from the church as defenders of idols.§ Such incidents would only contribute to place the iconoclasts in a still more

bishops: ικανοί βίβλοισι οὐκ ιφάντι, ἀλλὰ διὰ ψευδοπιπτακίων ἔηπάταν ήμας. Concil. Nic. act. V. Harduin. IV. f. 300. So it was said, also, that an interpolated letter of Nilus was read before the council. A bishop says: ή ιτιστολὴ φύγει ή αναγνωσθεῖσα, στρών φαλασινθεῖσα απάλιστοι καὶ ιτιλέμνοι ήμας. Act. IV. f. 187. Really the deception, as described at this council, must have been gross enough; nor is it very difficult to believe of such men as these bishops, that they might be guilty of a falsehood to justify their own conduct.

\* Ἀπεβλητὸν εἶναι καὶ αἱλοτρίαν καὶ ιβδίλυγμάντιν εἰς τὴν τῶν χριστιάνων ικελησίας πᾶσαν εἰκόνα εἰς παντοτάς ὅλης καὶ χρωματουργικῆς τῶν ζωγραφῶν πανοπλίχνιας πιπονημάντιν.

† Concil. Nic. II. act. VI. f. 422, καθὼς τοιαῦτα ὑπό τινων ἀτάκτων φιεσμένα προγίγνονται.

‡ The story is in the Life of St. Stephen, in the *Analecta Græca*, published by the Maurinians (T. I. p. 480).

§ Ἐκδικήσται εἰδόλαν.

hateful light before the people. It would therefore naturally be considered by the synod a matter of great importance to guard against such proceedings for the future; for this reason the council ordained, that no person should be allowed, without special permission from the patriarch or the emperor, to make any alteration in church vessels, church hangings, etc., on the ground of their being ornamented with figures.

Following the example of the older general councils, this council closed its proceedings with a more detailed confession of faith, containing a development of the orthodox doctrines hitherto received, with the corresponding formulas of condemnation; the doctrine concerning Christ's person being so constructed as that the polemics against images of Christ might be immediately derived therefrom. Its import was as follows: Christ, in his glorified humanity, though not uncorporeal, was yet exalted above the limits and defects of a sensuous nature; too exalted therefore to be figured by human art, in an earthly material, after the analogy of any other human body.\* We here discern the point of opposition between the views entertained by image-worshippers and by iconoclasts. The former considered the figures of Christ important as a practical confession of Christ's true humanity, and of the revelation of the divine life in the true human form; and the contrary seemed to them a denial of the incarnation of the Logos, or of his true human nature. But the iconoclasts looked upon figures of Christ, wrought by the hand of man, as a degradation of the glorified Christ, a denial of his super-earthly exaltation. On this principle, and from this point of view, the anathema was pronounced on those who sought to express by sensible colours the divine form of the Logos in his incarnation, who did not, from the whole heart, with a spiritual eye, worship him who, outshining the splendour of the sun, sits on the throne of majesty at God's right hand. The anathema was also pronounced on all who delineated in colours dumb and lifeless images of the saints which could serve no profitable end; instead of striving rather to produce living pictures of them by imitating the virtues exhibited in the story of their lives. It is, at the same time, to be observed, that the council

\* Οὐκέτε μὴ σάρκα, οὐκ ἀσώματος δι, οἷς αὐτὸς αὐτὸς λόγος θεούδικος εἴσπει, ἵνα καὶ ἀρρεῖ ὑπὸ τῶν εἰκαστησάντων καὶ μηδὲν θεὸς ἕσται παχύτερος. Concil. Nic. II. act. VI. Harduin, IV. f. 423.

thought fit to pronounce the anathema also on those, who refused to acknowledge the Virgin Mary as the mother of God, exalted above the whole visible and invisible creation, and to seek her intercession with sincere faith ; as also upon those who refused to acknowledge the dignity of the saints, and implore their intercession. From this fact alone we might conclude that the party of the iconoclasts must have had some special reason, in the circumstances of the times, for introducing such articles into their creed ; and we might be led to conjecture that they had been accused by their antagonists of denying the homage due to Mary and the saints. But actual proofs are also to be found, that such charges against the iconoclasts were circulated among the image-worshippers. Of the emperor Constantine, for example, it is related, that to bring the worship of Mary into discredit, he once held out a purse of money, and asked how much is it worth ? Being answered, that it must be of great value, he poured out the contents, and holding it up again, repeated the question. The answer was now the reverse, and he said : Just so is it with the worth of Mary before and after the birth of Jesus ; she now possesses nothing to distinguish her above other women.\* He is said to have rejected the practice of invoking the intercession of Mary and the saints.† He is also said to have disapproved the practice of calling a man a saint ; and to have treated the relics of saints with contempt. It is reported of the icono-

\* See, besides the Byzantine historians, the life of St. Nicetas, in the appendix to the first volume of the month of April, in the *Actis Sanctorum* of the Bollandists, s. 28.

† Constantine at least gave occasion for the remark, that he was not accustomed to begin or conclude his addresses in the usual manner, with an invocation to Mary and the saints, and this made the charge appear credible. The monk Theosterictos, a scholar of Nicetas, says, in his account of his life, that he had read thirteen addresses of the emperor, in which this introduction or this conclusion was wanting. See this life in the *Actis Sanct. Month April*, Vol. I. appendix, f. 28, s. 29 : *αὐτὸς δὲ διῆγεν τριακοσία λογίδαια, ἀπὸ παρέδοντος ταῖς δυοῖς ιβηριανάς, κριθαῖς μὲν ἵχοντα.* Even, the author of the violent tirades against this emperor, and against the iconoclasts (in the opp. *Johannis Damascene*, T. I. f. 613), who probably wrote in Constantine's own time, says of him, that he fought against the worship of Mary, of the martyrs and the saints, and affirmed the martyrs had benefited none by their sufferings but themselves. This author indeed considered it necessary to defend against his remarks the honour and dignity of the saints.

clasts generally, that, avoiding the phrase in common use, "We are going to this or that saint," viz. his church, they preferred to say: "We are going to Theodore, or to this or that Martyr or Apostle."\* Such reports cannot, indeed, be received with much confidence; for the image-worshippers were very ready to set any story afloat which might serve to fix on their opponents the stigma of heresy;† but at least, the spirit which gave birth to this controversy against images, the deeper principle at the bottom of the whole movement, would, in its negative tendency, lead on to further results.

At this council, Constantine, a monk, and bishop of Syleum in Phrygia, was consecrated patriarch of Constantinople; an elevation for which he was no doubt indebted to the zeal he had manifested against image-worship. The emperor himself presented him to the people, and, at the same time, published the decrees of the council pronouncing the anathema against all worshippers of images. He was now determined to enforce universal obedience to the decisions of the council. In every place, images were not only to be taken down, and every one who concealed them at home or distributed them about secretly brought to punishment, as transgressors of the imperial laws; but all figures of religious objects were to be removed from the ecclesiastical books,‡ and walls of churches embellished with pictures were to be washed over with paint. Governors of provinces and other official dignitaries courted the emperor's favour by exhibiting their zeal against images. Thus many a series of paintings, decorating the walls of churches, and representing the story of Christ, from his birth

\* See the Life of St. Stephen in the *Analecta*, pag. 481. Οὐχὶ οἱ πάντες ἄγιον, δικαῖον, ἀποστόλων καὶ μαρτυρῶν τὸ ἄγιον ὑμᾶς ἐξιστῶσιν παῖς ἰδογματισταὶ λιγυρτεῖς: τοῦ πατρὸς; τοῦ τοῦς ἀποστόλους. Πόθεν πάντες; οἱ τῶν τισσαράκοντα μαρτυρῶν. Ήτοῦ δὲ καὶ εἰς, εἰς τοὺς μάρτυρες Θεόδωρος.

† One of these, indeed, involves a contradiction, viz., when it is said (in Nicetas' account of his life), that Constantine was willing to call Mary the Θεότοκος, but not the Holy

‡ Leo, bishop of Phocaea (Φωκαία), remarked, at the second council of Nice, that in the city where he resided, above three hundred books had been burned on account of images. Demetrius, a deacon at Constantinople, declared, that when the oversight of the furniture of the church was committed to him (as *εκνοφύλακτος*), he found, from the church inventory, that two books with silver images were missing; and on inquiry he ascertained that they had been burned by the iconoclasts. Act. Concil. Nic. II. Act. V. Harduin. IV. f. 310.

to his ascension, and the effusion of the Holy Spirit, were destroyed. As a substitute for these, it was deemed better to paint the church walls with fruit-trees, animals, and the sports of the chase.\* Nevertheless, vast numbers, especially of the female sex, could not be deprived of these treasures; but secretly transmitted them as precious legacies and indispensable helps to devotion in their families; and to objects thus secretly preserved, and preserved only at the greatest hazard, the attachment became so much the stronger.†

The decrees of this self styled general council were subscribed, it is true, by the majority of the bishops; but in return, a more violent resistance was experienced by the emperor from a class of men who possessed great power through their influence on the populace, namely, the monks; many of whom were reverenced as saints. At the head of these stood monk Stephanus, who dwelt in the famous grotto of Auxentius, on a lofty mountain near the Bithynian sea-shore. Other monks flocked to him in great numbers, whom he inflamed with his own zeal, or, if they felt themselves unequal to the trial, advised to take refuge in those districts of the East and West where they would escape the reach of the emperor's arm. Constantine endeavoured, at first by marks of favour and distinction, to induce Stephanus to subscribe the decrees of the council, thinking it important to secure the authority of a person so generally respected, on account of the influence

\* See the Life of Stephen, l. c. p. 446. The author of this biography says of the alteration made by the emperor in a church of the Virgin Mary at Constantinople, which contained that series of pictures: 'Οπωροφυλάκιον καὶ ὁρνιοσκοπίον τὴν ιερατοῖςται ιεροῖςται l. c. 454.

† When the monk Stephen, of whom we shall say more hereafter, was thrown in prison on account of his zeal for the images at Constantinople, the wife of the keeper, who honoured him as a martyr, came to him secretly, and begged to be allowed the privilege of waiting upon him and of furnishing him with food. The monk would not consent, supposing that she belonged to the party of the iconoclasts; but the woman declared she was ready to convince him of the contrary to his own eyes, if he would but conceal it from her husband and the other keepers. She then brought from her chamber a casket locked, in which was concealed an image of the Virgin Mary holding the child Jesus, and images of Peter and of Paul; prostrating herself before these, and performing her devotions, she then gave them up to Stephen, that he might pray before them, and in so doing remember her. See the above mentioned Life, p. 503. The same thing might be done by many pious and devout women.

## CONSTANTINE'S ZEAL AGAINST MONACHISM.

it would have on other monks, and on the people at large. With this design he despatched to him a person of high rank, with a present of dried figs, dates, and other fruits, on which the monks were used to subsist; but Stephanus declared he could not be bought to deny his faith; that he was ready to die for the image of Christ; that he never would accept of a present from heretics.\* It was of no avail to banish the monks, or to imprison them—they would not give up; they unanimously persisted in their opposition to the iconoclasts, and industriously circulated the stories of wonderful cures wrought by images. It was necessary to compel them to obedience by violence, and the most cruel tortures were employed. Such as refused to subscribe the decrees of the synod were publicly scourged without mercy; were deprived of their noses, ears, or hands, or had their eyes bored out. Three hundred and forty-two monks, collected from different districts, and thrown together in one prison in Constantinople, were tortured in this manner.† It is true, the insulting language in which the monks spoke of the emperor, as a renegade from the faith, afforded at least some pretext for punishing them, not on the score of their religious opinions, but as guilty of disloyalty, as in the instance of the venerated monk Andrew, surnamed, from the grotto in which he usually lived, the *Calybite*, who died under the lash, because he had called Constantine a second Julian, or Valens.‡ The famous monk Stephanus, when summoned before the emperor, drawing a piece of coin from his cowl, said, What punishment must I suffer, should I trample this coin, which bears the emperor's image, under my feet? Judge from it, what punishment he deserves who insults Christ and his mother, in their images. So saying, he threw down the money and trod it under foot; upon which the emperor ordered him to be imprisoned for daring to insult the imperial image.§

No doubt the example of venerated monks, suffering every evil for the sake of their opinions, which they maintained with unbending firmness, must have operated more powerfully on the people, than the influence of the multitude of worldly-minded bishops, with whom it was but too evident the

\* See the account of the Life of Stephen, p. 457.

† See the Life of Stephen, p. 500.      ‡ See Theophanes Chronograph. f. 289.      § The Life of Stephen, p. 499.

interests of religion went for nothing, since they were only trimming their sails to the court breeze. A contemporary writer, who composed a discourse in defence of image-worship, gives us a picture of these bishops, which seems to have been drawn from the life.\* In replying to the objection, that images ought not to be tolerated, because such idolatrous use was now made of them by the populace, he says: "If such errors prevail among the people, it is the fault of the clergy, who exist for nothing else but to instruct the ignorant how they ought to believe and to perform their devotions. But the bishops of these times care for nothing but horses, flocks of sheep, and fields; how they may get the most for their grain, their wine, their oil, wool, and silk. They neglect their people, or do more for their bodies than for their souls." Such bishops were but poorly calculated to work a change in men's religious convictions.

But the emperor Constantine might easily be hurried, by the peculiar bent of mind which engaged him in this controversy against images, to carry his opposition against the prevailing views to an extreme. He looked upon the monks as the chief promoters of idolatry, of *obscuration*—for he styled them children of darkness.† He would have been glad to see the whole race of monks exterminated at a blow; ‡ but as martyrdom only served to increase the veneration for them among the people, he would have been still more pleased if by any device, however low, he could make them appear ridiculous to the multitude.§ Nothing so excited his indignation as to see men and women of rank embracing the monastic life; and as these, as well as the persons who influenced them, exposed themselves to violent persecutions, so nothing gave him greater pleasure than to succeed in prevailing upon monks to return to the world: such persons might safely calculate on being raised to some lucrative or honourable post; and to exchange the monkish cowl for secular apparel was to

\* *Orat. adv. Constantin. Cabalin.* in the works of John of Damascus. I. f. 622.

† *Ἐποίεις ἴδιματα, σκοτιδύτους.*

‡ He called the monks people whom nobody ought to remember, *τοὺς ἀμνημόνους*.

§ Thus he compelled certain monks to appear in the circus, with a woman in their arms, to excite the ridicule of the people. Theophan. f. 293.

exchange darkness for light.\* The same religious turn of life which was promoted by the extravagant veneration of relics, by the stories of miracles they had performed, and by the superstition which expected help from them, the same it was that inspired also the zeal for image-worship. It was, therefore, wholly in accordance with the other proceedings, that, inasmuch as the popular devotion was strongly directed to the relics of St. Euphemia, which were shown to the people as having miraculously distilled balsam, Constantine should order the casket which contained them to be thrown into the sea;† but, indeed, the popular faith in the pretended miracle was deeply rooted to be destroyed by such violent measures. The people were now assured that the emperor had made away with the relics on purpose to destroy such irrefragable miraculous testimony to the power of the saints and the lawfulness of their worship. Afterwards it was pretended to be revealed in a vision that the relics had come ashore on the island of Lemnos.

As image-worship agreed with the prevailing character of the devotion of this age, so it was generally the case that the more pious class were zealous image-worshippers. Hence the emperor would not be disposed to favour such as were given to piety, according to its usual form in this period. Now, although but little reliance can be placed on the reports of men who were interested in representing the emperor, whom they hated, as a heretic, especially when they bear such evident marks of exaggeration, yet perhaps there was some foundation for the story, that if a man stumbled, or received a sudden blow, and, as is usual in such cases, cried out, "Help, mother of God!" if a man joined in the observance of vigils at church, or frequented the public service on week-days, he was punished as the emperor's enemy, and reckoned by him among the friends of darkness.‡ Opposed as Constantine was to the prevailing sensuous tendency of the religious spirit, and feeling a repugnance to everything that bordered upon idol-

\* As one of them expressed himself, a certain Stephen (not the saint), whom the emperor prevailed upon to make this change, and whom he afterwards appointed to a place at his court: σύμιστος, διστοτα, τοῦ συντηκοῦ φρεαγγος διά του ἀφαρπαχθεῖς τὸ φῶς ἴδεινμαι. The Life of Stephen, p. 486.

† Theophanes, p. 294.

‡ Ibid., p. 296.

stry, it was in character with his whole bent of mind, that he should find something offensive in the designation of Mary as Mother of God. Nevertheless, he was well aware of the danger to which he would expose himself if he should seem to be injuring, on this side, the interest of the true faith, and derogating from the honour due to the virgin, and hence he ventured no further than slightly to hint his wishes. In a confidential interview with the patriarch Constantine, he asked him, perhaps without any distinct knowledge of the Nestorian controversy, what would be the harm of calling Mary Mother of Christ, instead of Mother of God? But the patriarch, embracing him, said, "God forbid, sire, that thou shouldst harbour such thoughts as these. Dost thou not see how Nestorius is condemned by the whole church?" The emperor fell back at once, observing that he had asked the question simply for the sake of information, and bidding the patriarch never to mention it.\* But the patriarch was not so reserved. From imprudence, or motives of personal ill-will, he informed others of what the emperor had said; and this probably was the first cause of the disgrace into which he soon fell with that monarch, which was followed by a series of humiliations and sufferings, terminating only by his death on the scaffold. For the rest, we may gather from this incident, with what a wary eye the emperor watched the public opinion respecting his orthodoxy; and we may conclude that, even though he was inclined to think and speak of the saints and of the Virgin Mary as was reported of him, yet he would be carefully on his guard against allowing such expressions to get wind. Nor would it be wonderful, supposing some such remark of the emperor about the Virgin Mary once got abroad, if, by passing from mouth to mouth, it became considerably magnified.

Thus by a course of despotism, consistently carried out during a reign of more than thirty years (down to A.D. 775), Constantine flattered himself that he had struck the final blow to image-worship. Every citizen of Constantinople had been placed under oath never again to worship an image.†

\* Theoph. f. 291.

† Ibid., f. 292. According to this account, the emperor had required a similar oath to be taken also in other parts of the empire. In the Life of Stephanus (f. 443, 44), the writer seems to speak of Constantinople only. Perhaps it was mere exaggeration, that they were obliged

Under this long reign there had risen up, it is true, a new generation, of whom a part, at least, had never seen an image, but had been nurtured in principles hostile to images; yet, by all his violent proceedings, the emperor could not hinder image-worship from being secretly propagated in a multitude of families; and that religious bent of mind, which could not be revolutionized at once by outward appliances, furnished an ever-present foothold for the return of this practice; and nothing was needed but a favourable change in the government to enable the party (which still had many adherents among the people of all ranks, excepting the army, but who were only kept back by the persecutions) to come forth, with greater zeal than ever, from their concealment. The way was prepared for this under the very eye of the emperor, whose nod was law. His son Leo had married an Athenian lady, Irene, from a family ardently devoted to image-worship. Wanting herself the essential temper of Christianity, she was the more inclined to set the essence of religion in externals. Superstition could at once pacify her conscience, and afford a prop to her immoralities. Yet Constantine, in giving her as a wife to his son, had endeavoured to secure himself on this side, by making Irene swear that she would renounce images.\* No oath, however, could bind Irene in a case where she believed the honour of God was concerned, and she might regard even perjury as a pardonable crime when committed for so holy an end.

The emperor Leo, who succeeded to the throne in 770, was firmly attached, it is true, to the same principles ~~with~~ as his father; but he possessed neither the energy nor the despotic sternness of the latter, being, in truth, of a milder temperament. The cunning and ambitious Irene contrived already to accomplish much which served to prepare the way for a revolution, without attracting the emperor's notice. The monks who, under the preceding reign, were obliged to conceal themselves, could again come forth from their hiding-places.

also to swear that they would have no fellowship with monks, nor even salute them, but call every monk an *obscurex*. It seems as if it might be gathered from the Acts of the second council of Nice (see on a future page), that the *bishops*, at least, were *everywhere* obliged to take this oath.

\* According to the report of *Cedrenus*, the emperor Leo afterwards, on discovering Irene's true way of thinking and acting on this point, reminded her of the oath she had taken.

Those of them who were honoured as saints, and who had not been seen for a long series of years in Constantinople, where in general the monastic life had almost wholly disappeared, ventured once more to show themselves in public ; \* and with a proportionate joy and enthusiasm, they were received into the families where their memory had been cherished as of persons to be venerated, or where their ancient friends still lived. The more pious gathered round them, and they began once more to exercise an important influence. This influence served, indeed, to kindle a zeal for the sensuous forms of devotion, as well as for image-worship ; but, what was better, it served also to excite a new zeal for active Christianity, to restore its quiet practice, which had been disturbed, and to bring entire families from the ways of vice to a Christian life and conversation.† The empress so contrived it, also, that many of the monks were promoted to the more considerable bishoprics : they were, probably, fast friends to image-worship, but doubtless yielded, for the present, in the way of accommodation to circumstances (*οἰκορομία*), so as to have it in their power afterwards to do more for the sacred cause. The emperor already began to be regarded as a friend of Mary and of the monks ; and it was expected, since one was connected with the other, that he would come out also as a friend of images—but this hope was disappointed. The empress Irene had combined with several of the chamberlains and other persons of the court to bring about the restoration of images, and at court image-worship was already practised without the knowledge of the emperor ; but, by discovering two images concealed under the pillow of the empress, he came upon the track of the whole design.‡ The members of this combination of image-worshippers were seized, scourged, exposed to public disgrace, and imprisoned. But Leo, having died early in the

\* Probably, to judge from the order of the events, here belongs what Theodorus Studita says in his life of the abbot Plato, concerning the re-appearance of the venerated monks at Constantinople : *ἀφ' οὐκείδημον τοῖς ή δόται φωτίζουσιν ιεροποιίουν μοναστῶν τοῖς ή δόται.* See Acta Sanct. Mens. April T. I. Append. f. 49, s. 17.

† See the abovementioned Life, s. 18 : *ἀφ' οὐκείδημον τοῖς ή δόται, οὐκείδης εἰκόνες μετίκλασσι καὶ μεταστοχίωσιν τις διοικέστων.*

‡ This is mentioned by Cedrenus as occurring in the fifth year of Leo's reign ; Stephanus relates only the punishment of those connected with the court, on account of their worship of images.

year 780, could take no precautionary measures against the course which might be pursued in the future by his surviving partner; or perhaps he had been lulled into security by the false pretensions of the cunning Irene.

Irene having assumed the government, in behalf of her minor son Constantine, resolved to do everything in her power for the restoration of image-worship; but political considerations induced her to proceed with caution, so as not to ruin the whole cause; for under the preceding reigns, not only had the episcopal chairs been filled by such alone as adopted the decrees of the iconoclastic council of Constantinople, many of whom were zealous opponents of image-worship, but, what was a greater difficulty—since the majority of the bishops of the Greek church were ever wont to follow obsequiously the direction of the court—the *army* was, for the most part, strongly devoted to the principles of their successful general, Constantine Copronymus; and the empress had to fear, therefore, the resistance of an armed force. On this account it was necessary to prepare the way by cunning for the execution of her designs. In the same proportion as monachism had been despised under Constantine Copronymus, it was now honoured. The monks obtained the most important offices of the church. In direct contrast with the reign of Constantine, the way was now open for all, even those of the highest ranks, to become monks; and such as exchanged the splendour of the world for the monastic life were held in especial esteem. The empress was, doubtless, by natural disposition, and independent of all outward aims by virtue of her peculiar religious turn, a warm friend of the monks. She placed the greatest reliance on their intercessions and their blessings; and the monks confirmed her in these feelings, her zeal for the honour of the images leading them to overlook her many vicious qualities: yet, at the same time, it was certainly her intention to employ the monks as the most zealous and influential agents she could choose for promoting the image-worship, nor did she calculate wrongly. She would now be anxious, also, to have a patriarch at Constantinople, who would fall in with her own views, and whom she could use as an instrument for accomplishing her designs. But she was either too timorous or too cunning to follow the method usually pursued, by removing at once the patriarch Paulus, who had thus far attached himself to the

party of the iconoclasts, and substituting another, of the opposite opinion, in his place; for by so doing she would give to the still important party of the iconoclasts a head, while the patriarch, substituted in his place, would appear to many no better than an interloper. Circumstances which she cunningly took advantage of, came opportunely to her aid, so that she was enabled to avoid all these evil consequences.

Paulus, who was then patriarch of Constantinople, induced by a severe fit of sickness, retired, in the year 784, from the palace of the patriarchate to a monastery. The empress complained of this step, and demanded the reasons which had led him to think of renouncing the patriarchal dignity. He said he could find no peace for his conscience since he had denied the truth; that, through the fear of man alone, he had ceased testifying for the universal tradition of the church, valid, in all times, against the heresy of the iconoclasts; that he had retired to a monastery for the purpose of doing penance; and he urgently intreated the empress to nominate in his place an orthodox man, who, it might be hoped, would find means of reconciling the church of the imperial city with the other head churches from which it had been severed by the prevailing heretical tendency, and of securing the victory once more on the side of truth; and he recommended, as his successor, Tarasius, the first secretary of state.\* As this event gave the first decisive impulse to all that was done from that moment for the restoration of image-worship, as the event was appealed to with great earnestness, and as if from a preconcerted understanding, and pains were taken to spread the story far and wide; a suspicion is naturally awakened that the whole thing had been contrived by the empress and her advisers for the purpose of operating on the minds of the multitude, and of preparing the way for the succeeding steps. But however disposed we might be to conjecture that the empress had hinted to the patriarch it would be better for him, under the pretence of sickness, to retire to a monastery, and by this voluntary abdication avoid the harder fate of being deposed; such a conjecture is met by the fact, that the death of Paulus,

\* The accounts in Theophanes, Cedrenus, in the life of Tarasius by Ignatius, c. I. in the *Actis Sanct.* published in the Latin translation *Mens. Februar. T. III. f. 577*, and in the imperial *Sacra*, addressed to the bishops of the second council of Nice. Harduin. *Council. IV. f. 38.*

which occurred soon afterwards, renders his previous sickness probable. It must be taken, then, as the substantial truth, that the patriarch was really induced by sickness to retire to his monastery—a step, indeed, which must appear altogether natural when viewed in connection with the peculiar turn of Christian life and manners that prevailed in the Greek church. We may accordingly look upon the transaction in the following light:—This voluntary step of the patriarch Paulus was laid hold of by the empress, and the case represented as if the patriarch had retired from compunctions of remorse on account of his previous denial of the truth. But it may also be supposed that the same reflections, which, awakened by his sickness, led him to retire to the convent, might awaken in him remorse for the course he had pursued with regard to images. This, in a weak man, would be extremely natural; especially if we consider that he had been trained up to the worship of images, and had yielded, in the preceding reign, to the dominant tendency merely through feebleness of character; \* that the new spirit of image-worship, which, through the influence of the court and of the monks, began once more to be powerful, had its effect on his mind; and that, to all this was added the impression, that his end was near. From the feeble character of this individual we may also account for it, that though equal liberty had for several years been granted to both parties, he had never h<sup>es</sup>itated to decide before in favour of image-worship, and to use the authority of his patriarchal rank for its restoration. The truth was, perhaps, that he stood in too much fear of the still powerful party of the iconoclasts, supported as they were by the imperial body-guard. But if he really was the first to recommend the emperor's secretary Tarasius as a suitable person to succeed him, he did so, no doubt, in conformity with a plan concerted by the court; or else this recommendation of Tarasius by the expiring patriarch was merely a story invented for the purpose of first drawing the attention of the

\* This is confirmed by a fact which Theophanes reports, viz. that in the reign of the emperor Leo he had struggled against accepting the patriarchate, because of the tendency, then prevailing at Constantinople, to oppose images, and that he was forced to accept it against his will. But it may be, that Paul's latter conduct first induced him to give this shape to the story, in order to palliate his earlier behaviour.

people to a man so far removed by his position from the spiritual order, and of palliating the irregularity of his choice. Such irregularity was indeed by no means a singular occurrence in the Byzantine empire, where sudden transfers from high civil posts to the service of the church might often be witnessed. But still, in the present case, where a man had been selected as the fit instrument for achieving a sacred work, it would doubtless seem to stand in need of some palliation.\* It was certainly a concerted plan that Tarasius, when offered the patriarchal dignity, should decline accepting it; that he should need to be urged, and should be called upon to state his objections publicly before the assembled people. He said that, in the first place, he feared to pass directly from business altogether secular, with unwashen hands, into the sanctuary; but in this he felt bound to submit to the divine call, as made known to him through the will of the queen regent. His greatest fear, however, and a difficulty which seemed to him insurmountable, was, that he must preside over a church anathematized as heretical by all the other head churches of the world. He could not undertake to bear the burden of such a condemnation, the consequences of which he proceeded to set forth in such language as was calculated to make a deep impression on the minds of his audience. For these reasons, then, he declared that he could not, with a good conscience, accept the office, unless it were upon the condition that all would unite with him in a petition to the queen regent, that she would take the proper measures for restoring union with the other head churches, and for convening, with their concurrence, an ecumenical council, by which the unity of doctrine might everywhere be re-established. His address was received by the multitude with marks of approbation; yet many who plainly saw the design lying at the bottom of the whole affair, and who no doubt were attached to the party of the iconoclasts, declared that there was no need of a new council.† But

\* It is singular, at the same time that it confirms what is said above, that in the *Sacra* addressed to the second council of Nice, this recommendation of Tarasius is not mentioned; but it is simply said, that by all experienced men in the affairs of the church who had been consulted on the subject of a worthy patriarch, Tarasius was unanimously selected.

† See Vit. Taras. c. III., and the address of Tarasius, in the acts of the second council of Nice, Harduin. IV. f. 26. In the latter passage, it is said: τοις δι ὀλίγους τῶν ἀφεύτων ἀνιστάλλοντο.

Tarasius took up the matter again, remarking that it had been an emperor, Leo, who banished the images from the churches, and the council of Constantinople had found the images already banished ; the matter, therefore, was still *sub lite*, since the ancient tradition had been arbitrarily attacked. And so it was settled that a general council should, with the concurrence of the other patriarchal churches, be convened.

Accordingly, a correspondence was once more set on foot, first with pope Hadrian I., who was invited to send delegates to a church-assembly, to meet at Constantinople. Hadrian declared himself satisfied with the orthodoxy professed by Tarasius, and with the zeal he manifested for the restoration of image-worship ; but it was only out of regard to this, and to the present emergency, that he was willing to overlook the irregularity in the election of one who had been elevated with so little preparation to the highest spiritual dignity. He sent two delegates to Constantinople, who were to act as his representatives at the council. It was now desired, that the synod should be held not merely under the presidency of the two first patriarchs, but that nothing might be wanting which could be reckoned among the marks of an ecumenical council, and that it might stand with decided prominence above the council of the iconoclasts, it was determined that all the five patriarchs should take a share in the presidency. Yet although it happened at the present time, by peculiar circumstances, that the orthodox Melchite, and not the Monophysite party, had succeeded in elevating a man of their own number to the patriarchate of Alexandria,\* and that there was therefore no difficulty in the way so far as this was concerned ; nevertheless, a great difficulty still remained, arising from the domination of the Saracens in Egypt and Syria, who for political reasons were not accustomed to allow of any negotiations betwixt the churches within their dominions, and those of the Roman empire. The patriarch Tarasius did, indeed, send delegates with letters, to the three other patriarchs ; but these delegates met on their journey a company of monks, who informed them, that under existing circumstances the object they had in view could not possibly be accomplished. If they were determined to proceed onward, they would not only involve

\* Comp. Walch's Geschichte u. s. w. Theil 10, S. 516.

themselves in the greatest perils without effecting their purpose, but, by exciting the suspicions of the Saracens, might bring down the heaviest calamities upon the already severely oppressed Christian communities in these districts.\* Since, then, they found it impossible to accomplish the object for which they were sent, they were obliged to content themselves with the best substitute for it which the circumstances would allow. The monks chose two of their own number, *John* and *Thomas*, whom they represented as being Syncelli of the patriarchs, and as possessing an exact knowledge of the prevailing doctrines in the orthodox churches of Syria and Egypt; and these—with the little authority they possessed—were made to present themselves before the council as plenipotentiaries and representatives of the three patriarchs, so as to give it the false appearance of having been held with the concurrence of all the five patriarchs.†

\* See the writing of these monks, which gives an account of the whole matter, and is wrongly cited in Harduin. IV. f. 137, as a writing of the patriarch.

† It is remarkable that Theodore Studita, with whom the authority of this council would stand high, inasmuch as they re-introduced image-worship, and who sometimes speaks of it as an ecumenical council, still intimates, that it did not strictly deserve the title ecumenical, and lays open the whole trick in the case of the so called representatives of the three patriarchs—the object of which he rightly explains as having been to command that respect from the people brought up in the principles of the iconoclasts which would be due to the authority of an ecumenical council. He says (I. I. ep. 38: *οὐδὲ γὰρ οἱ καθεδίοις ἀνίσχοντοι* their representatives) *τῶν ἀλλων πατριαρχῶν, ψεύδει*. He states, in the next place, certainly without truth, that even the papal delegates had come to Constantinople on other business, and not on account of the synod, and that they were compelled, in spite of the instructions they had received, to stand as plenipotentiaries and representatives of the pope. For this reason, on their return home, they were deprived by the pope of their spiritual offices. He then proceeds to say of the other patriarchs: *οἱ δὲ ἀλλοι οἱ μὲν ἀνατολῆς, ἀλλ' ὑπὲ τῶν ἵνταντα πρεσβεῖντες καὶ λαζίντες, οὐχὶ ὑπὲ τῶν πατριαρχῶν ἀποσταλίντες, ὅτι ματὶ δέονται, η̄ ματίροις, διὰ τὸ τοὺς Ἰθανούς διὸς δηλοντος* (fear of the Saracens) *τοῦτο δὲ ἵνταντο οἱ ἵνταντα, ἵνα τὸν αἰρετίζοντα λαὸν μᾶλλον πιλασσον ἀδεδέξειν οἱ τοῦ εἰκονισμοῦ δῆτιν ἀβροτόνται σύνεδον*. He states, that this council is considered in the Roman church merely as a *σύνοδος τοπική*. To be sure, the more rigid Theodore had reason to be dissatisfied with this church assembly, on account of their lenient treatment of the bishops who had belonged to the party of the iconoclasts, and of those convicted of simony; see below.

In the year 786 this church-assembly was opened at Constantinople. The plan, however, had not been well concerted. The majority of the bishops, having been created partly in the time of Leo and partly in that of his successor Constantine, still maintained their hostility to images, and among them were many zealous opponents, many from families that had long since banished images from their households, so that, from childhood, they had been accustomed to abominate them as idols.\* But still, owing to the servile spirit then reigning in the Greek church, they would not have ventured upon so stout a resistance to the will of the court, unless they had counted upon a powerful support from the army, and especially from the imperial body-guard, who cherished along with the lively remembrance of Constantine Copronymus a steady attachment to his principles. These bishops, with whom many of the laity† were associated,‡ held secret meetings previous to the opening of the council, for the purpose of devising measures for frustrating the patriarch's plans, and preventing the meeting of a council which they regarded as wholly unnecessary. The patriarch, who heard of this, reminded them that he was bishop of the capital, and that they were guilty of an infraction of the ecclesiastical laws by holding meetings without his consent, and exposed themselves to the loss of their offices. They now, indeed, relinquished their meetings; but still they endeavoured to carry on their operations in secret. Meantime the empress, with her body-guard, made her entrance into Constantinople; but the latter, instead of being men who could be relied upon to support the measures of the government, were, on the contrary, leagued with the bishops of the opposition. On the evening of the

\* So said several of the bishops at the second council of Nice, *actio I.* Harduin. T. IV. f. 60. *iv ταῦτη τῇ αἰσχοις ἡμῶν γεννθίνεται ἀντεράφημα καὶ πένθημα.*

† *Ἐρύσιμοι μετὰ λαῖξῶν τινῶν πολλῶν τὸν ἀριθμὸν.* Harduin. IV. f. 25.

‡ They were bishops from different countries; yet Phrygia, the original seat of this party, seems to have held the same precedence now. We find named among the heads of the conspirators against images, Leo, bishop of Iconium, in Phrygia; Nicolaus, bishop of Hierapolis in the same province; Hypatios, bishop of Nice in Bithynia; Gregory, bishop of Pisinus in Galatia; Georgius, bishop of Pisidia; Leo, bishop of the island of Rhodes; and another Leo, bishop of the island of Carpathus (Scarpano). See Harduin. l. c. f. 47.

thirty-first of July, the day before the one appointed for the opening of the council, an excited company of them assembled in the baptistery of the church, where the council was to be held, with noisy shouts, one exclaiming this thing, another that, but all uniting in the cry that there should be no council. The empress did not on this account falter in her purpose. On the first of August the council was opened. But when the ecclesiastical law was read, that no general council could be held without the assistance of the other patriarchs, (a law by which the decrees of the other council of the iconoclasts were afterwards declared to be null and void,) a large body of soldiers, perhaps at the instigation of the bishops of the opposition, assembled with wild and furious shouts before the doors of the church ; when the empress, deeming it best to yield to force, in order to conquer by cunning, sent one of her officers of the household to inform the assembled council, that they must dissolve, and yield to the violence of the multitude. The will of the Lord would afterwards soon be accomplished.\* The empress directed that the multitude, who were joined also by several of the bishops, should rave and shout against such as presumed to attack the authority of the seventh ecumenical council, until noon, when hunger caused the people to disperse. Thus the uproar subsided ; and the cunning Irene, pretending that the soldiers of the guard were needed abroad, drew them away from the city ; when they were broken up, and a new guard formed in their stead, on whom reliance could be placed. All the necessary preparations having been made, the general council was convened one year later, in 787 ; not at Constantinople, where disturbances from the party of the iconoclasts were always to be feared, but at Nicæa, where it might derive additional authority from the remembrance of the first Nicene council. The number of the members composing this council was about three hun-

\* Harduin. *Concil. IV. f. 28.* According to the declaration of Tarasius himself at the opening of the second Nicene council (l. c. f. 34), there were then but few bishops *decidedly* in favour of image-worship ; he says of these events : *ικανὴν πελναθροῦ ὥχλος Συμῶν καὶ πινγιας γίμων, χτῆρας ἡμῖν ἐ-βαλεῖν, οὐδὲ χιεὶ θεῖον ἱερόσθημα, ἵχοντος τοῖς ευρυποχίαν καὶ πινας συνεργήτας ἴτιοντον.* Among the few who boldly stood by the side of Tarasius was the abovementioned venerable abbot Plato, whose life was written by Theodore Studita. See *Acta Sanct. T. I. April. Appendix*, sec. 24, f. 50.

## SUDDEN CHANGE OF VIEWS

dred and fifty. The empress, in her proclamation for the council, declared, it is true, that every one there should express his convictions with freedom;\* but she had assured herself beforehand, that the bishops hitherto hostile to images would now yield to the prevailing spirit. If everything had not been already agreed upon and settled before the deliberations took place, it would have been impossible so quickly to despatch the whole business, in six sessions from the twenty-fourth of September to the sixth of October; so that in the seventh and last session held at Nice on the thirteenth of October, nothing remained but for the decisions to be formally published, and subscribed by all. The history of those six sessions, shows too, that further deliberations were not needed on the employment and worship of images.

At this council, many passages from the older church teachers, sometimes forged from the earlier and sometimes genuine from the later times, were read and quoted as testimonies in favour of images; miracles said to have been wrought by images were rehearsed from the lives of saints; nor were those wanting who affirmed they had witnessed such themselves. A presbyter testified, that on his return home from the council of Constantinople in the preceding year, he had been visited by a severe fit of sickness, and was cured by a figure of Christ.† Individual bishops, one after another, and then numbers of them together, came forward and renounced the errors of the iconoclasts, and desired to be reconciled with the Catholic church. Others appeared, who pretended now to have thoroughly examined the whole subject, and to have arrived at a sure and settled conviction,‡—bishops who, with a disgusting want of self-respect, bore voluntary testimony to their own stupidity and ignorance.§ Whole bodies of them exclaimed, we have all sinned, we have all been in error, we all beg forgiveness.|| One of those bishops, who now professed to repent of their former hostility to images, declared he had become convinced, by the declarations of Scripture and of the fathers, that the use of images was in accordance with the apostolic tradition. . Tara-

\* L. c. Harduin. f. 38.

† See Harduin. IV. f. 211.

‡ L. c. f. 39.

§ L. c. f. 41. Τῆς ἀρχας πον δημοσίας καὶ νομοσίας καὶ ιματηρίας δια-  
νοιας λοτι τεῦτο.

|| L. c. f. 62.

sius asked him, how it could happen that a bishop of eight or ten years' standing, as he was, should now, for the first time, be convinced of the tru<sup>h</sup>; to which he had the effrontery to reply, “The evil has existed for so long a time, and acquired so great an influence, that perhaps we were led into the error in consequence of our sins;\* but we hope in God to be delivered.” Several others† excused themselves on the ground that they were born, brought up, and educated in that sect; and it might doubtless be true of many, who had formed their opinions when the government allowed nothing to be said in favour of images, and who had not been able to examine the arguments on both sides, that they would now be easily convinced by the arguments of the image-worshippers. One of the bishops, Gregory of Neo-Cæsarea, said, “I am anxious to learn how my lord the patriarch and the holy synod shall decide”—afterwards he added, “Since this whole assembly speak and think alike, I am persuaded they have the truth.”‡ A very easy matter, to be sure, for men of this stamp, to whom the voice of the majority was always the same as that of truth, to change their opinions with each change of the times. Some who, under the reign of Constantine Copronymus, had been compelled to swear that they would renounce image-worship, now felt, or pretended to feel, scruples of conscience about professing other principles. The way was made clear for these by a decree of the council, who decided that it was no perjury to violate an oath made in contradiction to the divine law.§ Among the bishops who avowed their repentance, were some that had borne a part in the conspiracy of the iconoclasts the year before. These now declared: “We sinned before God and the church;—we fell through ignorance.”|| The same Gregory of Neo-Cæsarea, whose disgraceful confession has just been quoted, was one of the most forward leaders of the iconoclasts at the council of Constantinople; but the other party exulted to see such members of that council present also at this, and compelled to bear witness of their own disgrace, and to condemn their own teaching.¶ Those bishops who were willing to certify their

\* L. c. f. 48.

† L. c. f. 60.

‡ Ἡνίκα πᾶσα ἡ ὁμίλησις αὕτη τὸ ἐν λαζί καὶ φεροῦ, ἵματος καὶ  
ἰπληροφορητοῦ, ὅτι ἡ ἀληθινα αὕτη ἡτοῦ ἡ νυνὶ ζητούμενη καὶ ἀπεντοσμένη.  
f. 77. § L. c. f. 208. || F. 48. ¶ L. f. 128.

## PROTESTANT TENDENCY.

orthodoxy by signing a formal recantation, were not only restored to the fellowship of the church, but permitted, though not without some demurring, to retain their episcopal stations. That the council, in opposition to the practice of the church in similar cases, should treat with so much indulgence the men who had been at the head of the iconoclasts, and the chief managers of their intrigues, was a policy which no doubt seemed to be justified by the circumstances of the times. The party of the iconoclasts was still too powerful to be slighted altogether; and men were glad to adopt any means whatsoever, which served to deprive that party of its heads and principal adherents. But the fierce zealots among the monks were not to be satisfied with this policy of the court party.\*

As to the form of the recantation adopted in this case, the following particulars in it deserve to be noticed. The anathema was pronounced on all such as despised the doctrines of the fathers according to the tradition of the Catholic church; on all who said, that on points where no distinct and certain instruction is given by the Old or New Testament, we are not bound to follow the doctrines of the fathers, of the ecumenical synods, or the tradition of the Catholic church.† From this, it may be conjectured, that many of the iconoclasts, when opposed by the authority of the church tradition, were in the habit of replying, that even this, separate from the authority of Scripture, could not be considered by them as any decisive authority—a mark of the protestant tendency which proceeded from this party.‡ At the suggestion of one of the Roman delegates, an image was brought into the assembly, and kissed by all the members.§ In the seventh session, to determine

\* This appears afterwards in the case of Theodorus Studita. The monks made it a matter of complaint against the majority of the bishops in this council, that they had obtained their official stations by simony. See the letter of the patriarch Tarasius to the abbot John. Harduin. IV. f. 521. Ταύτων οὖτος ὅντων ἴνεκάλισαν τῇ συνόδῳ τὸ πλίον μέρος τῶν εὐλαβῶν μυηταχῶν, καὶ ἡμῖν δὲ προτυπούσομεν την ἕγκλιον ταύτην ὅτι οἱ πλίοντες τῶν ἴεροκόπων χερήμασιν ἀνήσαντο τὴν ιερωσίναν. This agrees with the remarks of an image-worshipper respecting these bishops, which we have already cited. Thus their dependence on the dominant court-party becomes still more evident.

† L. c. f. 42.

‡ See one of the anathemas pronounced in the eighth session, f. 484. Εἴ τις πάσαν παράδοσιν ἴερων πατερικήν, ἔγγειον ἢ ἀγγειον, ἀντιτείνεται.

§ See Act. V. f. 322.

what constituted images, and what reverence was due to them, it was resolved, that not only the sign of the cross, but also images drawn with colours, composed of Mosaic work,\* or formed of other suitable materials, might be placed in the churches, on sacred vessels and vestments, on walls and tables, in houses and in the streets, as well as images of Christ, of the Virgin Mary, of angels, and of all holy and devout men. But the great injustice that was done to the advocates of the image-worship, by broadly accusing them of idolatry, appears from the following express determination of the council : —“ Bowing to an image, which is simply the token of love and reverence, ought by no means to be confounded with the adoration which is due to God alone.”† The same was true also of the cross, the books of the Evangelists, and other consecrated objects. To this symbolical expression of the feelings was reckoned likewise the strowing of incense and the burning of lights.‡ The honour paid to an image was to be referred to the object which the image represented.

The synod having completed its business in seven sessions, the patriarch, with the whole assembly, was directed to repair to Constantinople. Here, on the twenty-third of October, was held the eighth session, in the imperial palace of Magnaura, and this was attended by the empress herself, accompanied by her son Constantine, and surrounded by an immense multitude of the people, for whom the impression of this grand assembly was no doubt especially designed. The empress commanded that the decrees which had been passed should be publicly read ; she then asked the bishops whether these decrees really expressed their common conviction, and all having declared, with repeated exclamations, that they did, she caused the decisions to be placed before her and her son Constantine, and

\* Εἰκόνες οὐ ϕωβίδος.

† F. 456. Ἀστακοὺς καὶ τιμητικὴν προσκύνησιν ἀπονίμειν, οὐ μὴ τὴν κατὰ πίστιν ἡμῶν ἀληθινὴν λατρείαν, οὐ πρέπει μόνη τῇ Θείᾳ φύσι.

‡ In the letter also addressed by Tarasius, in the name of the council, to the empress, the προσκύνησις κατὰ λατρείαν is distinguished from the other kinds of προσκύνησις ; —e. g. from that kind of obeisance which it was the custom to pay to the emperor. Hence it is added, in the spirit of Byzantine adulation, Εστὶ γαρ προσκύνησις καὶ οὐ κατὰ τιμὴν καὶ φόβον, οὐ προσκυνοῦμεν ἡμεῖς τὴν καλλίγενον καὶ ἡμιωτάτην ὑμῶν βασιλίσσαν. Harduin. IV. f. 476.

both subscribed them. When this was done, the assembled bishops repeatedly shouted, in the usual form, Long live the orthodox queen-regent.

Thus, after so long and violent a contest, the worship of images once more gained the victory in the Greek church; but the means to which, as we have seen, it was necessary to resort in order to achieve this victory, proves that the image-breakers still formed a strong and important party. And, of course, it was impossible that, by such means, a tendency of spirit which had taken so deep a hold of a portion of the people, could be suppressed at once. Reactions would ensue from the party oppressed, by means of which, as we shall see at the opening of the succeeding period, a new series of violent conflicts against image-worship would finally be introduced.

It only remains for us to cast a glance at the part taken by the Western church in these disputes. The negotiations between the popes and the iconoclast emperors show to what extent the worship of images had become dominant in the church of Rome; but it was otherwise with the church of the Franks. The only question which here suggests itself is, whether in the Frankish church image-worship was opposed from the beginning, since we find that in the time of **Gregory the Great**, **Serenus**, bishop of Massilia, was a violent opponent of images, or whether this tendency of the religious spirit was first called forth in the Frankish church by the progress of culture in the Carolingian age? We should be able to come to a more certain decision of this point, if any distinct account were still to be found of the first proceedings, with regard to images, in the Frankish church, under the reign of **Pipin**. By occasion of an embassy sent by the Greek emperor Constantine to King Pipin, the points of dispute then generally existing between the Greek and Latin churches, and consequently the dispute about images, were discussed in an assembly of bishops and seculars at Gentiliacum (Gentilly), in 767; but in none of the historical records which mention this assembly do we find a word respecting the conclusion arrived at on the subject of images. It only remains, therefore, to draw from what afterwards followed a probable inference, with regard to preceding events. As pope Paul the First signified to the king his satisfaction with what had been done at this assembly,

which, moreover, papal delegates took part,\* we might be led to conclude that image-worship was here approved. But this conclusion, however, would not be warranted by the facts; for it is by no means clear that the pope's approbation had any special reference to the matter in question. The business transacted at this assembly related not only to other doctrinal matters besides this, but also to a disputed question of a *politico-ecclesiastical* nature, of great interest to the pope. The Greek emperor had endeavoured to obtain from the king of the Franks the restoration of those possessions in Italy wrested by the latter from the Longobards, and presented to the church of Rome or to the patrimony of St. Peter. This Pipin had refused. Now the pope, in expressing to the king his satisfaction at this refusal,† might well be induced to pass a milder judgment on the decisions of the synod with regard to images; especially since, at all events, the Frankish church would have to agree with the Roman in opposing the Greek destruction of images. It may have been the case, also, that this common opposition to the then Greek church was more sharply expressed by the assembly; while, on the other hand, the peculiar points of opposition to the doctrine of the Romish church were presented in a more covert and gentle manner. If the tendency of religious spirit, which, on this particular subject, now made its appearance in the Carolingian age, had been altogether new in the Frankish church, it must have met there with some degree of resistance; but of this we find at the least indication.

We are more exactly informed respecting the part taken by the Frankish church in these controversies under the reign of Charlemagne. This emperor himself stood forth as a zealous opponent of the second Nicene council, and of the principles expressed by that council on the subject of image-worship. The hostile relations which now arose between the emperor

\* The words of the pope: *Agnitis omnibus a vobis pro exaltatione sanctae Dei ecclesiae et fidei orthodoxae defensione peractis letati sumus.* See Cod. Carolin. ep. 20. Mansi Concil. T. XII. f. 605.

† The pope had said to the king, when speaking of the answer to be given to the Greek messengers by this council (see Cod. Carolin. ep. 26. Mansi T. XII. f. 614), he hoped that he would answer nothing nisi quod ad exaltationem matris vestre Romanae ecclesiae pertinere noscatis, and that he would on no account take back again what he had once given to the apostle Peter. This hope the pope now saw fulfilled.

Charles and the empress Irene, who had retreated from her first advances towards betrothing her son *Constantine to the Frankish princess Rothrud*, might be supposed to have an influence on his manner of expressing himself against that council, and various sarcastic remarks might seem to betray a temper somewhat ruffled by outward occasions of excitement. But certainly the emperor's conduct may be satisfactorily explained from the spirit of purer piety which animated him and his ecclesiastical advisers, and from the impression which the language of Byzantine superstition and Byzantine exaggeration, so fond of indulging in a fulsome verbiage, would make on the simpler feelings of the pious Frankish monarch. Three years after the close of this last Nicene council, therefore, in 790,\* there appeared, under the emperor's name, a refutation of that council;† and although there can be no doubt that he composed this celebrated work, entitled “The Four Caroline Books” (*quatuor libri Carolini*),‡ as he intimates himself, not without some assistance from his theologians, who perhaps furnished him with the matter, and had some share in elaborating it, especially Alcuin,§ yet we may easily believe concerning

\* As is said in the preface itself (p. 8, ed. Heumann).

† He himself says: *quod opus aggressi sumus cum conniventia sacerdotum in regno a Deo nobis concesso catholicis gregibus prelatorum.*

‡ Which work was first published by J. Tillius (*Jean du Tillot*, afterwards bishop of Meaux), in the year 1549.

§ That Alcuin, whom the emperor Charles was in the habit of consulting on all contested points of doctrine, and whom he employed as an author, must have had some share in the work, appears evident, particularly from the striking resemblance of one passage in the Carolinian books (IV. c. 6, pag. 456, 457, ed. Heumann) with a passage in Alcuin's Commentary on the Gospel according to John (I. II. c. IV. f. 500, ed. Froben), if we consider that he published this commentary not till ten years after the appearance of the Carolinian books; since it is clear from the letter *ad soror. et fil.* which is prefixed to the commentary, that these books appeared complete in the year of pope Leo's escape from the conspiracy which had been formed against him, and of the transfer of the imperial crown to Charlemagne. The most important objection to the supposition that Alcuin assisted in the composition of this work is, the chronological one, brought forward, after Frobenius (see T. II. opp. Alcuin. f. 459) by Gieseler, that Alcuin was then absent on a visit to England. But even if this were so, still he could, while absent, assist the emperor with his pen; and that he did so, is confirmed by a tradition found in the English annalist, Roger of Hoveden, of the 13th century, relating to the year 792, which states that Alcuin wrote and transmitted to the king of the Franks a letter against the decrees of the second coun-

a prince who exercised so independent a judgment on religious matters, and who even directed the attention of Alcibiades himself to important corrections which might be made in his writings, that this work, which he published under his own name, was not merely read in his presence, and found, or made to coincide with his own views, but took from him, in a great measure, the form in which it finally appeared. He says himself, that zeal for God and the truth \* had constrained him not to keep silence, but to appear publicly against prevailing errors.

In this work, while he distinguishes the use from the abuse of images in church-life, he combats the fanaticism of the iconoclasts as well as the superstition of the image-worshippers, attacking both the assemblies which represented these tendencies and laid claim to the character of ecumenical councils. It was objected to the iconoclasts, that they were bent on utterly exterminating those images which had been appointed by the ancients for the decoration of the churches, and for memorials of past events; † that they unwise placed all images in one and the same category with idols; and that the members of their council had given to Constantine the honour which is due to Christ alone, in saying he had delivered them from idols; yet the council of the iconoclasts is treated with more lenity than that of the image-worshippers; and the well-meant, though misguided zeal of the former party for the cause of God, called forth by the excessive superstition of the latter, was acknowledged. In opposition to the harsh expressions which had been used against them at the second Nicene council, it is affirmed that they had by no means involved themselves in so great a sin by stripping the churches, through a mistaken zeal, of the images which served to embellish them. ‡ With far greater acrimony the emperor expresses his op-

eril of Nice, in the name of the English bishops and princes. Though this report comes from too late a period to possess the force of a trustworthy testimony, and also contains an anachronism, yet some ancient tradition may be lying at the foundation of it.

\* *Zelus Dei et veritatis studium.*

† *Imagines in ornamentis ecclesiarum et memoria rerum gestarum ab antiquis positas, c. V.*

‡ See I. I. c. 27. I. IV. c. 4. In abolendis a basilicarum ornamentis imaginibus quodammodo fuerunt incauti, had erred from imperitia, not from nequitia.

position to the principles of the second Nicene council, as well as to the arguments by which they were defended; and hence the interest for a more spiritual piety manifests itself in a remarkable manner. While to images no other end is assigned than to serve as ornaments to the churches, or as means for perpetuating the memory of events, and while the use or the abuse of them for these ends is declared to have no further bearing on the interests of the Christian faith,\* every other way of regarding or of using images is opposed in the most decided manner; and it plainly appears how entirely foreign from the author of this work was that enthusiasm for art and for images, which we observe among the Greeks. He calls it absurd and foolish † to maintain, as had been done at the second Nicene council, that images exhibited visibly to the eye the walk and conversation of the saints, when in fact their virtues and merits were seated in the soul, and could not be represented in sensible materials and by colours—could not be made objects of sensuous perception. “Can anything be known,” he asks, “about their wisdom, their eloquence, their profound knowledge, by the outward sense of sight?” ‡

It is represented, indeed, in this work, as being the true end of images to perpetuate the memory of holy deeds; yet not in any such sense as that they were needed to bring up to remembrance that which should be ever present to the religious mind, but in the sense that, as sensible representations of things which, even without such outward memorials, were present to the religious consciousness, they served to embellish the churches; and accordingly the image-worshippers were censured for maintaining that images were *necessary* to perpetuate and to call up the memory of holy things. To ascribe to them *so much* importance as this seemed in direct contradiction to the spiritual nature of Christianity. They who so expressed themselves confessed to a singular blindness; they acknowledged so poor a memory as that, without the help of images, they must be afraid they should be withdrawn from the

\* L. II. c. 21. *Utrum in basilicis propter memoriam rerum gestarum et ornamentum sint, an etiam non sint, nullum fidei catholicae afferre poterunt prejudicium, quippe cum ad peragenda nostre salutis mystagia nullum penitus officium habere noscantur.*

† *Quanta sit absurditatis quantaque dementiae.*

‡ See l. I. c. 17. p. 100.

service of God, and from the worship of his saints. They acknowledged themselves incapable of so raising the mind's eye above sensible things as to draw from the fountain of eternal light without help from the material creation.\* As the spirit of man is supposed to stand in such fellowship with him after whose image it was created, as to be competent to receive into itself, without the mediation of any created thing whatever, the image of the truth itself, which is Christ, so it is the height of madness to affirm that this spirit needs a memento in order not to forget him. This would be a proof of criminal weakness, and not of that freedom which must be regarded as the characteristic mark of the Christian standing-ground.† The faith of a Christian should not cling to sensible things; it must be looked for only in the heart. The meaning of this is, that the faith of Christian has respect to that which is invisible, and that it must, with the heart, rise to that which is invisible—in proof of which he quotes Rom. viii. 24 and x. 8. The following is one of the prominent ideas constantly reverted to in this work:—God, who fills all things, is not to be adored or sought after in sensible images, but should be ever present to the pure heart.‡ “Unhappy memory,” it is said in another place, § “which, in order to think of that Christ who should never be absent from the good man's heart, needs the presence of an image, and which can enjoy the presence of Christ only by seeing his image painted on a wall or on some sensible material; for such a remembrance, nourished by images, comes not from the love of the heart which inwardly constrains us to think of Christ, but is thrust upon us from without, even as we are compelled to present before our souls the very objects we hate, as soon as we behold them in a painting. Of such people it is verily to be feared, that, should they by some sickness lose their eye-sight, or by some accident be deprived

\* Magna se cœcitate obrutos esse fatentur, qui vim illam animæ, quæ memoria nuncupatur, ita se vitiatam habere demonstrant, cui nisi imaginum adminiculum suffragetur, ab intentione servitutis Dei et veneratione sanctorum ejus recedere compellatur: nec se idoneos arbitrantur, mentis oculum supra creaturam corpoream levare ad hauriendum eternum lumen, nisi creature corporeæ adjutorio fulciantur, l. II. c. 22.

† Cum hoc infirmitatis sit vitium, non libertatis indicium.

‡ Non est in materialibus imaginibus adorandus vel querendus, sed in corde mundissimo semper habendus, l. III. c. 29.

§ L. IV. c. 2. pag. 432.

of their image, they would utterly forget that Saviour whose memory ought ever to be present to their minds. We Christians, who, with open face beholding the glory of God, are changed into the same image, from glory to glory (2 Cor. iii. 18), are no longer bound to seek the truth in images and pictures; —we who, through faith, hope, and charity, have attained, by his own help, to the truth which is in Christ.\* In opposition to the second Nicene council, which had compared the images of Christians with the Cherubim and the tables of the law in the Old Testament, the different points of view of the Old and of the New Testament were distinctly set forth. “ We, who follow not the letter which killeth, but the spirit which maketh alive—who are not the fleshy but the spiritual Israel; we, who look not at the things which are seen, but fix our minds upon those which are unseen; rejoice to have received from the Lord mysteries greater not only than images, which contain no mysteries at all, but even greater and more sublime than the cherubim and the tables of the law—for the latter were the antitypes of things future; but we possess truly and spiritually what had been prefigured by those symbols.”† The image-worshippers, as we have seen, were wont to compare images, in reference to the higher things they represented, with the sacred Scriptures. In opposition to this, the far greater importance of the sacred Scriptures, as a means of cultivating and promoting the Christian life, is most distinctly set forth. Holy Scripture is a treasure richly stored with all manner of goods: he who comes to them in a devout temper of mind, rejoices to find that which he sought in faith.‡ By the Nicene council, as well as by the image-worshippers generally, images were compared with the sign of the cross; but even this was attributing too much importance to them: The sign of the cross is here set quite above images, not, to be sure, without falling into a like error with the image-worshippers, since the outward symbol and the idea represented by it are not, as they should have been, kept distinctly apart. Under this banner, and not by images, it is said, the old enemy was vanquished; by these weapons, not by showy gauds of colour, the power of the devil was destroyed; by the former and not by the latter, the human race was redeemed; for on the cross,

\* L. I. c. 15. p. 89.

† I. c. 19. p. 107.

‡ L. II. c. 30.

not on images, hung the ransom which was paid for the world. The cross, and not a picture, is the sign of our king, to which the warriors of our army constantly look.\* The comparing of images at that council with relics of the saints, and the requiring a like reverence to be paid to them, is also noticed with disapprobation. Thus no small injury was done to the saints,† since raiment which had been worn by the saints, and things of the like kind, ought to be reverenced, because by contact with their persons they had acquired a sacredness which begat respect. Images had been sanctified by no such contact, but were made, as it happened, sometimes beautifully, sometimes not, according to the skill of the artist, or the tools and materials he employed. To show reverence for the bodies of saints was a great means of promoting piety; *they* reigned with Christ in heaven, and their *bodies* were destined to rise again from the dust. To show such reverence for images, which had never lived, and could never rise again, but must be consumed by fire or by natural decay, was quite another thing.‡ Considered in this point of view, not only the act of prostration (*προσκύνησις*), defended by the image-worshippers, was condemned as a transfer of the adoration belonging to God alone to a created object, § and as a species of idolatry; but every mode of testifying that reverence or love to lifeless images, which, for the reasons above stated, might be shown to the bones of the saints, was rejected as unbefitting and irrational. It was denounced as a foolish thing to express those feelings for 'feles' images which could properly be referred only to living beings; || and the multifarious customs in regard to this matter, which had sprung up among the Greeks, were sharply rebuked. "You may painfully study attitudes," it is said to the image-worshippers, "while making your supplica-

\* L. II. c. 28 p. 215.

† L. III. c. 24.

‡ Ibid.

§ Adorationem soli Deo debitam imaginibus impertire aut segnitim est, si utecumque agitur, aut insanie vel potius infidelitatis, si pertinaciter defenditur. See p. 379, i. e. if a man allows himself to be hurried, no matter how, into an act of this sort, it is either folly or ignorance; but if, when made aware of the falsehood, he still obstinately defends it, this is madness or unbelief, want of the right faith in God.

|| Aliud est hominem salutationis officio et humanitatis obsequio adorando salutare, aliud picturam diversorum colorum fucis compaginatam sine gressu, sine voce vel ceteris sensibus, nescio quo cultu, adorare, l. I. c. 9.

tions, with incense, before your images ; we will carefully search after our Lord's commands in the *books* of the divine law : you may keep lights burning before your pictures ; we will be diligent in studying the Holy Scripture."\* But here the emperor introduces an objector :—" You deride those who burn lights and strow incense before dumb images, and yet you yourselves burn lights and incense in churches, which are but senseless buildings." To this he replies : " It is one thing to light up the places consecrated to God's worship, and in these places to present to God the incense of prayer and sensible incense ; it is quite another to set lights before an image that has eyes and sees not, to burn incense before an image that has a nose but smells not. It is one thing solemnly to honour the house of God's majesty, built by believers and consecrated by the priests, and quite another irrationally to bestow presents and kisses on images formed by the hand of some painter, for churches are the places where believers congregate ; where their prayers are heard by a merciful God ; where the sacrifice of praise is offered to the Most High and the sacrament of our salvation (mass), is celebrated, where troops of angels assemble when by the hands of priests the community of believers present their offering, where the word of God comes to water the thirsty heart." The emperor objects to the Greeks, that, as he had been informed by his own ambassadors and those of his father, while they bestowed much pains on the fitting up of images, they let their churches go to decay, and to which he contrasts the magnificent endowment of the churches in the Frankish empire †.

As the Greeks were inclined to bestow the greatest attention on the outward ceremonial of image worship, even to the neglect of the more practical duties of Christianity, we see how just a conception the emperor had formed of the actual condition of the Greek Church, when we find him reminding them that, while the sacred Scriptures nowhere enjoin image-worship, they do teach that men should eschew evil and follow

\* L. II. c. 30.

† L. IV c 3 Perneque basilicæ in eorum terris non solum lumina-ribus et thymiamatibus, sed etiam ipsis carent tegminibus, quippe cum in regno a Deo nobis concesso basilicæ ipso opitulante, qui eas conservare dignatur, affluenter auro argentoque, gemmis ac margaratis et cæteris va-nustissimis redundent apparatus.

after that which is good.\* With regard to the nice distinctions by which it was sought to justify or palliate the worship of images, he says all this might be well enough among the learned, but it would answer no good purpose with the multitude. Though the educated, who reverenced images not for what they are but for what they represent, might escape superstition; yet they must ever prove an occasion of stumbling to the rude and uncultivated, who revered and worshipped in them only what they saw. And if our Saviour denounces so heavy a curse on him who should offend one of these little ones, how much heavier must this curse fall on him who either forced a large portion of the church into image-worship, or threatened those with the anathema who rejected it.†

In refutation of the appeal to miracles said to have been wrought by images, the emperor remarks: "It was not clear from unimpeachable testimony that such miracles had actually been wrought—perhaps the whole was a mere fiction. Or if such things had actually happened, still they might only be works of the evil spirit, who by his deceptive arts sought to beguile men into that which is forbidden.‡ Or even if we were bound to recognize in these cases wonderful works proceeding from God himself, yet even this would not suffice to set the propriety of image-worship beyond question: for if God wrought miracles by means of sensible things to soften the hearts of men, yet he did not intend by so doing to convert those sensible things into objects of worship—as might be shown by many examples of miracles from the Old Testament."§ Nor would the emperor allow that any weight was to be given to the evidence of a vision of angels in a dream, to which one member of the Nicene council had appealed. No doubtful matter could be settled by a dream; for it was impossible, by any evidence, for one man to prove to another that he had actually seen what he pretended.

\* Deum inquirendum docuit (Script. S.) per Domini timorem. non per imaginum adorationem, et eum, qui vult vitam et cupit videre dies bonos, non imagines adorare, sed labia a dolo et linguam a malo instituit cohibere. Nec picturam colere docuit, sed declinare a malo et facere bonitatem, I. 23.

† L. III. c. 16.

‡ Ne forte calliditatis suo astu antiquis hostiis, dum mira quædam demonstrat, ad illicita peragenda fraudulenter suadeat.

§ III. c. 25.

“ LIBRI CAROLINI.”

Therefore dreams and visions ought to be carefully sifted. Dreams inspired by the divine Spirit did, indeed, occur in the sacred Scriptures ; these, however, were but individual cases. Dreams, again, needed to be distinguished in respect to their origin ; in respect to the question, whether they proceeded from divine revelation, or from the person's own thoughts, or from temptations of the evil spirit ;\* commonly, however, they were deceptive. And as it concerned the vision of an angel, it behoved, even where such a vision had been vouchsafed, to follow the direction of St. Paul, and try the spirits, whether they were from God ; and this was to be known, according to the instruction of our Lord, from their fruits. Now as image-worship is an ungodly thing, it could not have been a good spirit from whom the exhortation to such worship proceeded.† As we have already said, reference was often made, in defending image-worship, to the picture of Christ sent to king Abgarus ; but neither the truth of this story, nor even the genuineness of the pretended correspondence between Christ and king Abgarus, was acknowledged in the Carolinian books.‡

It is true, the worship of saints was not by any means placed in these books in the same category with the worship of images, the former being acknowledged to be a truly Christian act ; at the same time, however, it was circumscribed within the limits which the Christian consciousness demands. While, at the second Nicene counsel, images which it was pretended had wrought miraculous cures, were compared with the brazen serpent, the advice here given is: “ Let those who are afflicted with any bodily disease, repair to images and look up to them, that so, when they find they are not cured by thus looking, they may return and trust the Lord, that through the mediation of the saints they will be restored to health by him, who is the Author of all health and of all life.”§ Men ought not to believe that the saints, who in their life-time sought not their own glory, but often disdained the marks of honour which it was intended to show

\* Veniunt nonnunquam ex revelatione, multoties vero aut ex cogitatione aut ex tentatione aut ex aliquibus his similibus. III. c. 25.

† L. III. c. 26.

‡ See l. IV. c. 10.

§ I 18. Solus Deus adorandus, martyres vero, vel quilibet sancti venerandi potius, quam adorandi. l. IV. c. 27.

them, were pleased or benefited by such overwrought and foolish testimonies of respect.\*

Although this book appeared under the name of an emperor, yet the Byzantine habit of idolizing royalty was castigated in it with great severity; for the vestiges of the old apotheosis were still retained in the titles and honours bestowed on the Byzantine emperors. The Greek image-worshippers had, in fact, appealed to the custom of prostration, usually observed before the images of the emperor. By this occasion the emperor Charles was led to express himself strongly against such a custom. "What madness," said he, "to resort to one forbidden thing, for arguments to defend another!"† He then goes on to represent this custom as having sprung from, and as being a remnant of, that pagan idolatry, which ought to be utterly abolished by Christianity.‡ It was the duty of Christian priests to take their stand against customs so repugnant to Christianity. So, too, the mentioning of the empress and emperor in the acts of the council, under the title of *divine* (*Σεῖοι*), as well as the citation of the imperial rescripts by the name of *divalia* (*Σεῖα γράμματα*), was expressly condemned, as savouring of paganism.§ The low flattery of the bishops who compared the emperors, as restorers of the pure Christian doctrines, with the apostles, is severely reprobated;|| and the occasion is seized for drawing out the contrast in full between the emperors and the apostles.¶ As these bishops had, at the same time, asserted that the emperors were enlightened by the same Spirit with the apostles, it is observed on this point, that the emperors were here in no

\* L. III. c. 16.

† Nam quis furor est, quaeve dementia, ut hoc in exemplum adorandarum imagium ridiculum adducatur, quod imperatorum imagines in civitatibus et plateis adorantur et a re illicita res illicita stabiliri paretur? III. 15.

‡ Cum apostolicis instruamur documentis, nullam nos dare debere occasionem maligno, cum talem gentilibus occasionem demus mortalium regum imagines adorando et ab his exempla sumendo.

§ L. I. c. 3. Qui se fidei et religionis Christianæ jactant retinere fastigium, qui et intra ecclesiam novas et ineptas constitutiones audacter statuere affectant et se Divos suaque gesta Divalia gentiliter nuncupare non formidant.

|| O adulatio cur tanta præsumis!

¶ Tanta est distantia inter apostolos et imperatores, quanta inter sanctos et peccatores. l. IV. c. 20.

respect distinguished from other Christians, for that spirit was none other than the Holy Spirit; and it was very clear that all true Christians possessed the Holy Spirit; for St. Paul, Rom. viii. 9, says, He that hath not the Spirit of Christ is none of his.

The synod is censured, again, for having allowed themselves to be guided and instructed by a woman; for having suffered a woman to take part in their meetings, though in direct contrariety to the natural destination of the female sex, and to the law given by the apostle Paul commanding that women should be silent in the church assemblies. The woman was to teach and admonish only in the family circle—to this alone the passage in Titus ii. 3, referred.\*

We remarked, in the history of the church-constitution, that the emperor Charles ascribed to the popes a primacy over all other churches, and a certain right of superintendence over all ecclesiastical affairs; and that in ecclesiastical matters he was always glad to act in concert with them. Accordingly, we find this way of thinking and this effort plainly manifesting itself in the Carolinian books, though in all other respects the emperor expresses himself with so much freedom, evidently departing, in important points, from the principles of the Roman church.† In this work, he notices the fact, that while in the Frankish church the unity of *doctrine* with that of Rome was always preserved, so by occasion of a visit which pope Stephen made to the Frankish church, unity was restored also to their church *Psalmody*.‡ He then remarks, that by his own efforts, this conformity to the psalmody of the church of Rome was still further promoted, not only in Frankish churches, but also in Germany, Italy, and among

\* Aliud est enim matremfamilias domesticos verbis exemplis erudire, aliud antistibus sive omni ecclesiastico ordini vel etiam publicæ synodo quædam inutilia docentem iuteresse, cum videlicet ista, quæ domesticos dehortatur, eorum et suum in commune adipisci cupiat profectum, illa vero in conuentu ventosæ tanturi laudis et solius arrogantiæ ambiat appetitum. III. 13.

† He says here, I. I. c. VI. p. 51, respecting the relation of the other churches to the Roman, omnes catholice debent observare ecclesiæ, ut ab ea post Christum ad munierandam fidem adjutorium petant, quæ non habens maculam nec rugam et portentosa hæresium capita calcat et fidelium mentes in fide corroborat.

‡ Ut quæ (ecclesiæ) unitæ erant unius sanctæ legis sacra lectione, essent etiam unitæ unius modulationis veneranda traditione.

some few of the northern tribes which by his means had been converted to the Christian faith.\*

As he remarks here, however, that all should seek help from the Romish church next *after Christ*, it is evident, that he was accustomed to refer his Christian convictions in the first instance to Christ; and in regard to what he believed he had found to be Christian truth by the illuminating influences of the Spirit of Christ—as for example, in the convictions he entertained on the subject of images,—he could not be moved to give up anything to the authoritative word of a Roman bishop. Accordingly, he presented by the hands of abbot Angilbert, his refutation of the second Nicene council to pope Hadrian.† The latter, judging from the standing-point of the Roman church-teachers, of course could not agree with him on this subject; and he transmitted to the emperor a formal reply‡ which, in point of theological depth, cannot be compared with the "Carolinian books," and assuredly was not calculated to shake so deep-rooted a conviction.§ At the assembly held at Frankfort-on-the-Main, in 794, these contested points were discussed in the presence of papal legates; and by the second canon of this council the adoration of images (*adoratio et servitus imaginum*) was condemned. It was however doing injustice to the second Nicene council, to accuse them of maintaining that the same worship ought to be paid to images of the saints as to the holy Trinity;|| a doctrine against which that council had taken special pains to guard. Perhaps the bishops purposely avoided entering into too nice investigations and determinations with regard to this matter, lest a controversy might be provoked between the Frankish church and the papal legates who attended the council.

\* See I. I. c. VI. p. 52, 53.

† It still remains uncertain, whether the emperor sent his book against the council of Nicæa to the pope before or after the meeting of the assembly at Frankfort.

‡ Mansi Concil. T. XIII. f. 759.

§ The object which the pope had in view, as he avows, in writing this refutation, *ad incredulorum satisfactionem et directionem Francorum*, was one which he certainly could not effect by such arguments.

|| *Ut qui imaginibus sanctorum, ita ut d. Trinitati servitum aut adorationem non impenderet, anathema judicare :fir.*

## REACTION OF THE CHURCH-SYSTEM.

### III. REACTION OF THE SECTS AGAINST THE DOMINANT SYSTEM OF DOCTRINES.

WE have yet to speak of a reaction of the Christian consciousness, within the church, against this ecclesiastical system which had been formed by the combining of Christian with foreign elements—a reaction on the part of rising and spreading sects that stood forth in opposition to the dominant church—presenting a series of remarkable phenomena of the religious spirit, extending through the mediaeval centuries, and accompanying the progressive development of the church theocratical system. We discern the commencement of this reaction in the period where we now are; having already noticed the germ and premonitory symptoms of it in the contests which Boniface had to maintain with the opponents of the Romish hierarchy in Germany. But it was from the Greek church especially, that an impulse proceeded which continued to operate with great force in promoting the development of this opposition.

In spite of all persecutions by fire and sword, the remains of those sects, which arose in the early period of the Christian church from the commingling of Christianity with dualistic doctrines of the ancient East, had been still preserved in those districts where they were natives, and could be constantly supplied with fresh nourishment from Parsism. Their opposition, however, to the dominant church, would necessarily be modified, in many respects, by the changes which had taken place in that church itself. Originally this opposition had its ground in an oriental mode of thinking that made Christianity subordinate to its own ends, and was directed against the peculiar and fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith. And while it is true that, even at present, the sects which had sprung up and grown out of this beginning, never so far denied their original one-sided tendency, as to embrace the Christian truth in its purity and completeness; still the opposition was now directed against *one* of the main elements in the corruption of Christianity; and against many of those doctrines, which, being grounded in this corruption, were alien from primitive Christianity. These sects having, from the first, stood out against the union of Christianity with Judaism, now entered into the contest against those doctrines and insti-

tutions in particular, which had grown out of the mixture of Jewish with Christian elements ; and in so far, this opposition might serve to prepare the way for the purification of the church.

Thus we meet with a sect in this period, which had sprung up in the way above described, and which flourished in the districts reckoned sometimes to Armenia, sometimes to Syria, where such tendencies had always been preserved. The followers of this sect were known by the name of *Paulicians*. It is an hypothesis of both the authors to whom we are indebted for the most important information we possess respecting this sect,\* though neglected by all succeeding writers, that this sect was an offshoot of Manichæism, and that it took its origin from a woman, Callinice by name, who lived in the district of Samosata, somewhere about the fourth century, and whose two sons, Paul and John, were considered as the founders of the sect. From the former of these, it is said, moreover, that the sect took its name, and it was the opinion of one party, that the name *Paulicians* was derived in the first place from a combination of the names of both the founders, in the form Παυλοιωναι : ai.† But we have strong reasons for doubting the truth of this whole account.‡ In the first place, as it regards Manichæism ; the truth is, that in this period, there was a universal inclination to call everything of a dualist tendency, Manichæan ; while no one seemed correctly to understand the distinctive marks which separated the Gnostic from the Manichæan tenets. We find nothing at all, however, in the doctrines of the Paulicians, which would lead us to presume that they were an off-shoot from Manichæism ;§

\* Petri of Sicily, sent by the Greek emperor Basilius Macedo to Tephriacum, Armenia, to treat for the exchange of prisoners (see the history of the Paulicians published by the Jesuit Rader, Ingoldstadt, 1604), and Photius, in his work against the Manichæans, which in substance differs but little from the former, published in the *Antedicta Graeca sacra et profana*, ed. J. C. Wolf, Hamb. 1723 T. I. et II.

† See Photius, I. I c. II. I. c.

‡ On this point, as in most of what we have to say concerning this sect, we must agree with the ably-discriminating and well-thought essay of Gieseiler. See the *Theologischen Studien und Kritiken*, B. II. Heft. I. 1821.

§ Nothing is to be observed in their opinions or practices akin to Manichæism or Parsism except in what Johannes Ozmensis, of whom we

## DID THE PAULICIANS DERIVE THEIR

on the other hand, we find much which contradicts such a supposition ; as for example, the fact that they considered the creation of the world as the creation of a spirit at enmity with the perfect God,—of a Demiurge, in a sense of the Anti-Judaizing Gnostics ; while Mani considered the creation of the world as a purifying process, ordained and instituted by the Supreme Being himself. In the organization of the sect, we look in vain for the distinction, which belongs to the very essence of Manichæism, of a two-fold standing, the esoteric and the exoteric,—that of the “elect” and that of the “auditors.” Although Photius sometimes hints at a distinction of esoteric and exoteric among the Paulicians, yet it is certainly one altogether foreign from the spirit and character of this sect ; and there was a disposition gratuitously to foist upon them such a distinction, partly because contradictions were detected in their doctrines, which, considered from their own point of view, had no existence, partly because it was taken for granted that whatever was peculiar to the constitution of the Manichæan sect, would hold good also of the Paulicians. On the contrary, we may confidently reckon it among the characteristics of the Paulicians, that they knew of no higher distinction than to be in the true sense of the word Christians ; that they recognized no loftier position than that of a *χριστιανός* or *χριστοπολίτης* : and hence, too, nothing higher, than the complete and pure knowledge of the truths belonging to this position. To separate these from all debasing mixtures, and to give them universal spread, was their highest aim. The Scriptures were prized by them at a vastly higher rate than they could be according to the principles of Manichæism ; and it is certain, that when they sought to attach themselves so closely to the sacred Scriptures they did so, not in the way of accommodation to the universal Christian principle,—not barely as a means by which to procure the readier access for their tenets to the minds of other Christians ; but it is evident, even from the manner in which their teachers write to the members of the sect, and from the order and denominations of their ecclesiastical officers, that

shall say more hereafter, says concerning them, when in his tract against the Paulicians, p. 87, he ascribes to them a certain adoration of the sun. This, however, does not well harmonize with the other doctrines of the sect.

they designed and strove to derive their doctrines from the New Testament; and particularly from the writings of the Apostle Paul. Far more do the Paulicians, in this respect, as well as in their prevailing practical tendency generally, agree with the sect of Marcion.\* Now since the Marcionite sect, as we learn from what Theodoret says respecting the vast number of Marcionites in his diocese, was widely disseminated in those districts, we might consider the Paulicians as being an offshoot from this Gnostic party, with which they had the closest resemblance. Indeed, we know from the reports of Theodoret and Chrysostom, that these later Marcionites, being drawn for the most part from uneducated country-people, were extremely ignorant in common matters, and not much better informed with respect to the doctrines of their own master.

We might be allowed to suppose, then, that an effort at reform, awakened among these degenerate Marcionites by some special cause or other, and particularly directed, by the spirit of Marcionitism, to the restoration of primitive Christianity as taught in the epistles of St. Paul, had preceeded the Paulician sect. Else we must suppose—which would be an impossible thing—that a reforming effort had been awakened, by the study of the New Testament Scriptures, among the founders of this sect, lingering remnants of old Gnostic parties, and that this effort, uniting Gnostic elements with a practical Christian piety derived from this study of the New Testament, took its own accord a direction similar to Marcionitism. As to the story about Callinice, while there is no good reason for rejecting, as an absolute fiction, the tradition that two men, Paul and John, sons of a Callinice, who was a follower of Manichaism or Gnosticism, laboured in these districts for the spread of some such opinions;† yet it cannot

\* It may also be remarked, that in the Anathemas published by Jacob Tollius, (Insignia Stinerar. Ital. p. 106,) with the sects of the Bogomiles and Euchites are named not the Paulicians but the *Marcionites*—we have here then the recognition of a sect from the Marcionites.

† Gieseler thinks the whole story about the sons of Callinice ought to be regarded as a fable. The Paulicians were constantly appealing to St. Paul and St. John as the two genuine apostles—this constant appeal to St. Paul being, in truth, the occasion of their name, Paulicians. This circumstance, as also the reluctance which men felt to allow the Paulicians the honour of being named after two apostles, led to the invention of

be regarded as a matter of the 'least importance, as affecting the question concerning the Paulicians; and as to any connection between these sons of Callinice and the Paulician sect, we have every reason to regard it as no better than a fiction. It is certain that the Paulicians themselves did not hesitate to condemn the sons of Callinice, and Mani also, with whom they were arbitrarily associated.\* Nor can it justly be affirmed, that this was but a pretence, an accommodation, devised for the purpose of concealing their real opinions; for very far were they from allowing themselves to be moved, by worldly fears or considerations, to any false pretensions, with regard to the persons whom they regarded as the true founders or teachers of their sect.† As it was assuredly nothing but the traditional name Paulicians, which led men to suppose there must have been some particular person by the name of Paul from whom the sect derived its origin, so it happened that there were many who traced the name of the sect to a later Paul, an Armenian, who was undoubtedly one of the teachers of the sect,‡ though not the individual from whom its name was really derived, that name being, in all probability, of a much earlier date. Thus it is manifest, that no one of these explanations of the name Paulicians rested on any historical basis, but that all of them grew out of the hypothesis, that the name must necessarily have been derived from some false teacher, who established a new and distinct epoch. But the form of the word by no means suggests a derivation of that sort; since by every rule of analogy it should have been, if so derived, *παυλικοί* or ~~παυλικοί~~ *παυλινοί* (Paulians). At the same time, it is most probable that the form

the story that the sect was founded by two false teachers Paul and John. This explanation, however, is quite too artificial; and although the Paulicians did attribute a special authority to the Gospel of John, yet it is by no means clear, that they attached themselves so closely to that apostle as they did to the apostle Paul.

\* See Photius, I. I. c. 4, p. 13. l. c.

† Petrus Sicius affirms, it is true, that the Paulicians were genuine disciples of Mani, of the sons of Callinice, εἰς καὶ κινοφωνίας τινὰς ταῖς πρώταις ἵπαντις αἰγίσιοις; yet he allows that the Paulicians themselves leaned solely on the authority of later teachers, and acknowledged no others. See p. 40.

‡ Photius says (I. I. c. 18), of this Paul: *ιε τούτου δὲ τοῦ Παύλου μηδε εἴη ιλαχιστη τῆς ἀποστασίας καὶ τὴν ἵπαντις ἄλκειν μᾶλλον οὐ ιε τῶν τῆς Καλλινίκης παιδῶν τὸ μυστήριον Μανιχαῖον ἔδεις νομίζουσιν.*

ταυλικοι lies at the root of the name, and that from this, ταυλικίανοι was afterwards derived. And we may perhaps rest in the conclusion, that as this sect, like the earlier Marcionites, opposed St. Paul to St. Peter, and, attaching themselves to the former, were for restoring the true Pauline Christianity, they were hence called Paulicians, as in truth we find it intimated by Photius himself.\* And at some later period it was attempted to trace the origin of the name to some individual who was the founder of the sect.

Constantine, who taught in the latter half of the seventh century, chiefly under the reign of Constantine Pogonatus, might, with far more propriety, be considered the original founder of the sect, which appeared in this period under the name Paulicians. He belonged to some Gnostic, probably to a Marcionite sect, which had spread from Syria and Armenia into these districts, and resided in the village of Mananalis, not far from Samosata. It deserves to be noticed, as a fact which undoubtedly had some influence on the nature of his attainments and the character of his Christian life, that at a time when he had either not read the Scriptures of the New Testament at all, or only in scattered fragments, he received a complete copy of them as a present from a certain deacon, in gratitude for the hospitable entertainment he had met with in Constantine's house, when returning home from captivity, probably among the Saracens. Constantine now earnestly applied himself to the study of these Scriptures, which, and more particularly the epistles of St. Paul, made a deep impression on his mind, and gave a new direction to his thoughts and to his life. Certainly we must ascribe to the hateful spirit which gave a false and invidious explanation to everything done or said by a heretic, that Constantine and his followers were accused of hypocritically pretending to derive their religious opinions from the New Testament, in order to escape the sword of the executioner, or in order to gain access, by means of this deception, to the minds of those whom they wished to proselytize. On the contrary, we are bound to presume that the fundamental ideas which he found presented in those Scriptures had a powerful influence on his

\* L. II. c. 10, p. 190. From the apostle Paul οὐ φιλιππανοι ταραχάφοραι; though he is wrong in saying that they called themselves by this name.

mind, so that he felt himself constrained to stand forth as a reformer, not only as it related to the dominant church, but also to the sect of which he was a member. At the same time, however, he was, in spite of himself, governed by the principles of his sect, by dualism, which he could not be induced to renounce. Studying the Scriptures of the New Testament with a mind already preoccupied by these principles, he believed that he found the same principles enforced in what he there read, respecting the opposition of darkness to light, flesh to spirit, world to God. It was by a Christianity drawn from the writings of St. Paul, and in part of St. John, but apprehended under the forms of the Gnostic dualism, that the Paulicians were, from this time onward, bent on bringing about a renovation of the church, a restoration of the pure apostolic doctrines. To designate his profession as an apostolic reformer, Constantine took the name of Silvanus; and so it became the custom afterwards, for more distinguished teachers of this sect to call themselves by the names of the several companions of St. Paul—a custom which may be rightly regarded as marking the distinct aim which they had before them. They professed to be simply the organs of the Pauline spirit, like those who were the companions of St. Paul in his labours. Constantine laboured twenty-seven years, from about 657 to 684, with great activity, for the advancement of his sect. Its further spread drew upon it a new persecution. In the year 684, or one of the other last years of the reign of Constantine Pogonatus, that emperor sent Simeon, an officer of his household, into those districts, empowering him to punish with death the leader of the sect, and all recusants, and to bring such as were disposed to recant to the bishops, for the purpose of being more fully instructed by them in pure doctrine. Constantine, if we may credit the account given by opponents, was, at the command of Simeon, stoned to death by faithless disciples, at the hand of whom was his own ungrateful adopted son, Justus.\* But the major part of those who were handed over to the bishops persisted in maintaining their old opinions; upon which Simeon undertook to deal with them, and bring them over to the pure doc-

\* It is reported, that the memory of Constantine's death was preserved, by the name given to the spot where it occurred, Σωπός. Phōtius, I. 16.

trines of the church. But as he was a layman, and therefore somewhat at a loss for arguments, as well as more unprejudiced, he was struck with the remarkable appearance of Christian sincerity in their behaviour, and more and more attracted by the principles of the Paulician sect. With these impressions, he returned to Constantinople; but after remaining there three years, under his former relations, tired of the constraint of living in a society where he was forced every moment to conceal or deny his real convictions, he secretly repaired to Cibossa, in Armenia, where the remnant of Constantine's followers were still to be found. He there became head of the party, and took the apostolic name Titus. After labouring three years as presiding officer of the sect, and inducing numbers to join it, he and his followers were accused before the bishop of Colonia, by the same treacherous Justus who had acted so prominent a part in the stoning to death of Constantine. At the suggestion of this bishop, the emperor Justinian II. directed, in the year 690, a new examination into the tenets of the sect, the result of which was that Titus, and many others besides, died at the stake.

One of the individuals who escaped death on this occasion, by the name of Paul, was now placed at the head of the sect; and he appointed as his successor his oldest son Gegnæsius, whom he named Timothy. From this time the sect was divided into two parties. The schism grew out of the antagonism betwixt a catholic and a protestant principle. Gegnæsius held that spiritual gifts were communicated by tradition, and connected with the regularity of succession. On this ground he founded his claim to be regarded as the principal leader of the sect; but his younger brother, Theodore, refused to acknowledge any such principle, maintaining that such outward mediation was unessential, and that he had received the spirit immediately from the same divine source with his father.\* Under the reign of Leo the Isaurian, new complaints were lodged against the Paulicians at Constantinople, and the emperor ordered Gegnæsius to appear at the capital and undergo a trial. The examination was committed to the patriarch, before whom Gegnæsius contrived to answer all the questions

\* Phot. I. 18. Μὴ πατερός in τοῦ λαβότος διντέρα δύσι μιτασχῆν, ἀλλ' in τῆς περάτης δωρῆσαι > i. οὐν ὁ πατήρ ταύτην εἴλενσε.

proposed to him respecting his orthodoxy in a satisfactory manner ; attaching, however, quite a different sense from the true, one to the formularies of church orthodoxy. The patriarch asked him why he had left the Catholic church. Gegnæsius replied, that he had never entertained the remotest wish of forsaking the Catholic church, within which alone salvation was to be found. But by the Catholic church, he meant only the Paulician communities, called, as they believed, to restore the church of Christ to its primitive purity. The patriarch demanded why he refused to give the mother of God the reverence which was her due ? Gegnæsius here pronounced the anathema himself on all who refused reverence to the mother of God, to her into whom Christ entered, and from whom he came,—the mother of us all. But he meant the invisible, heavenly city of God, the celestial Jerusalem, mother of the divine life, for admission of the redeemed into which Christ had prepared the way, by first entering it himself as their forerunner. He was asked why he did not pay homage to the cross ? Gegnæsius here pronounced the anathema on all who refused to venerate the cross ; but by this he understood Christ himself, called by that symbolical name. Furthermore, he was asked why he despised the body and blood of Christ, and refused to partake of it ? The reply to this also was satisfactory ; but by the body and blood of Christ he was accustomed to understand the doctrines of Christ, in which he communicated himself. So also he answered the "question respecting baptism, but by baptism, he understood Christ himself, the living water, the water of life. This trial having been reported to the emperor, Gegnæsius received from his sovereign a letter of protection, securing him against all further complaints and persecutions.

We might readily conjecture that the emperor Leo, that determined enemy of images, was disposed to befriend the Paulicians ; and that the issue at this trial, which was so favourable to their cause, was brought about by his influence ; for a certain affinity existed between the spiritual tendency of the Paulicians and that of the iconoclasts. The Paulicians, too, were violently opposed to image-worship : they always began by attacking this superstition, accusing the dominant church, on this ground, of idolatry ; and perhaps—as seems to be indicated by an Armenian controversial tract against the

Paulicians which has recently come to light\*—the attack on image-worship was the occasion by which many were first led to separate from the dominant church, and then, invited by the spirit of reform, which manifested itself in that sect, to unite with the Paulicians. It cannot be assumed, however, that all iconoclasts would, as a matter of course, be favourably disposed to the Paulicians; for that the fact was not so appears evident from the example of the later iconoclast emperors. And it is well known that the iconoclasts were the more eager to show their attachment to the church orodoxy on all points but one, and, to remove all suspicion on this score, in proportion as the disposition was strong to charge them with heresy. From these considerations it must still remain uncertain whether the emperor Leo *purposely* favoured the Paulicians; but if the report which has come down to us respecting the trial of Gegnaesius agrees with the truth, it can still hardly be supposed that the patriarch would have made it so easy for that heresiarch to deceive him, unless he had some good reason for allowing himself to be deceived. If he had not, he would, without doubt—especially as the deceptive arts of the Paulicians were, to some extent, understood—have proposed such questions to Gegnaesius, as would have compelled him to distinct explanations.

On the death of this Gegnaesius, after an active service of thirty years, he was succeeded by his son Zacharias; who was opposed, however, by another heresiarch, by the name of Joseph, so that a new schism arose among the Paulicians. This Joseph was compelled, by threatening dangers from the Saracens, to transfer the seat of his labours to Antioch in Pisidia; and the sect now spread beyond the boundaries of

\* We mean the polemical tract of John of Ozun, so called from his native city, Ozun, in the province of Tascir, in Greater Armenia, where he was born A.D. 668. Subsequent to the year 718, he became Catholicos, or primate of the Armenian church. His works were published in 1834 by the Mechartarists of the island of St. Lazari near Venice, with Aucher's Latin translation. In his discourse against the Paulicians, John says, whenever they met with inexperienced and simple people, they first began with speaking against images. See p. 76. He says (p. 89), that many iconoclasts, when ejected from the Catholic church, joined the Paulicians. It were to be wished, that the historical allusions of the words, "ad quos Paulicianos iconomachi quidam ab Alvanorum Catholicis reprehensi advenientes adhæserunt," might be traced out in the original sources by those acquainted with Armenian literature.

Armenia into the countries of Asia Minor.\* Joseph was succeeded by a certain Baanes, who, from the Cynic mode of life which he adopted and encouraged, received the surname of "filthy" (οὐραπός), which brought him and his party into bad repute. But at this time (near the beginning of the ninth century), the sect, which had been so rent by inward divisions and injured by the influence of bad teachers, began once more to lift its head under the auspices of a new reformer, who rose up in their midst.

Sergius came from the village of Ania, not far from the town of Tavia, in Galatia, and was won over to the sect while yet a young man.† He was led to join it by a singular incident, worthy of being noticed, because it shows how numbers might be induced, by the defective instruction of the clergy, which failed to satisfy their religious needs, to join the Paulicians. He once met with a woman belonging to this sect, who asked him, in the course of their conversation, whether he had ever read the gospels. Sergius replied in the negative, adding that this was a thing which belonged exclusively to the clergy; that the mysteries of holy Scripture were too exalted for laymen. Hereupon the woman said, "The holy Scriptures are intended for all men, and they are open to all, for God wills that all should come to the knowledge of the truth; but the clergy, who forbade them to be studied by the laity, wished to withhold from the latter the mysteries of the divine word, lest they should become aware of corruptions which the clergy had introduced into them. For the same reason it was only single portions of Scriptures, torn from their proper connection, which were publicly read in the churches." She then

\* Unless the account of the Byantine historian, Cedrenus, places at too early a period what happened not till later, a seat had already been prepared in Thrace for this sect, under the emperor Constantine Copronymus; for this historian, in the eleventh year of the reign of Constantine, relates that the emperor, after having reconquered the Armenian province Melitene, transplanted many Paulicians to Constantinople and Thrace.

† Petrus Siculus, who treats (p. 54) of Sergius, says nothing about his having sprung from a family connected with the sect. But Photius (p. 95) says, that his father Dryinos was a member of the sect, and that Sergius, therefore, had been instructed in its doctrines from his childhood. Yet his own report of the conference of Sergius with the Paulician woman contradicts this statement, and would lead us rather to suppose that Sergius then belonged to the Catholic church.

asked him whom it was our Lord meant (Matt. vii. 22), where he speaks of those who would plead that they had wrought miracles, and prophesied in his name, but whom he would nevertheless refuse to acknowledge as his; or who were the sons of the kingdom, of whom our Lord says that they should be thrust out of it (Matt. viii. 12). "They are those," said she, "whom you call saints, of whom you say that they perform miraculous cures,\* expel evil spirits, whom you honour, while you neglect to honour the living God." These words made a deep impression on the mind of Sergius. He diligently studied the writings of St. Paul. He obtained from them a better knowledge of what belongs to a vital Christianity, and came to perceive more clearly the difference between the godlike and the ungodlike, the spirit and the flesh. On the ground of this antithesis, distinctly expressed as his point of departure, he combated the confounding of Christianity with the world in the effete *churchism* of the state religion; but, at the same time, he grounded his practical antagonism on the theoretical one of the Gnostic dualism.

He set himself up as a teacher, under the name of Tychicus; and laboured for thirty-four years with great zeal, and indefatigable activity, traversing every part of Asia Minor, for the advancement and confirmation of the Paulician communities, and for the spread of the Paulician doctrines; and it was certainly not without justice that, speaking from his own point of view, he could say, in one of his epistles to a Paulician community, "I have run from East to West, and from North to South,† till my knees were weary, preaching the gospel of Christ."‡ He seems to have imitated the example of St. Paul, also, in refusing to receive the means of support from others, and striving to maintain himself by the labour of his own

\* The question comes up, how did the Paulicians understand this?—Did they mean that the story about the miracles of the saints were fictitious; or that they really performed such works, but did so by the power of the Demiurge "whom they served?"

† Which words are important, as serving to fix the geographical point from which his labours commenced and extended

‡ Απὸ ἀντολῶν καὶ μίχει δυσμῶν καὶ (ἀπὸ) βούρβας καὶ (μίχει) νότου θύεμον πηρόσαν τὸ οἰαγγύλιν τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῖς ἴμοις γένασι βαρέοντα. Pet. Sic. p. 60, where the words are cited more fully and accurately than in Photius, l. l. p. 112.

hands. To this end he followed the trade of a carpenter.\* Even his opponents would not refuse to Sergius the praise of strict morality, and of those kind and gentle manners which win the heart, and by which he was enabled to conciliate even his bitterest enemies.† He gained many followers, especially by his peculiar mode of first presenting before them simply the doctrines of practical Christianity, which, by other teachers, were made to give way to a mere formal orthodoxy, until he had won their confidence; when, having gained this advantage, he proceeded gradually to inveigh against the dominant church.‡ Owing to the manner, also, in which Sergius himself had been first drawn to this sect, many of the laity would be easily attracted to him and to his disciples, especially when they heard them repeating the hitherto unknown words of the evangelists, and of St. Paul, and exposing to view the contradiction between these teachings and many of the ordinances of the church.§ Even among monks, nuns, and ecclesiastics, he found many willing auditors.|| But conscious of labouring as a reformer, he was, no doubt, accustomed, when speaking of himself, to adopt a tone which, making every allowance for the hyperbolical language of the East, cannot be pronounced entirely free from the charge of a self-exaltation, inconsistent with the essence of Christian humility. He thus writes to one of the communities: "Suffer yourselves to be deceived by no man, but be assured that you have received these doctrines from God; for we write you out of the full conviction of our hearts. For I am the porter, and the good shepherd, and the leader of the body of Christ, and the light of the house of God. I, too, am with you always, even unto the end of the world;¶

\* Phot. I. I. p. 130.

† Καὶ ταπεινὸς ἦνος καὶ διάστως καπιτοχηματιούνος τρόπος καὶ ἡμιρότητος τούς σικεῖς, ὑπονομεύοντα (should doubtless read ὑποναιόντα) μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς τραχυτεροὺς διακιμένους ὑπολειποντά τι καὶ συλαγωγοῦσα. Phot. I. I. c. 22, pag. 120. Of course, all these good traits in a heretic were but a hypocrite's mask, worn for the purpose of enabling him more easily to carry on his deception.

† Phot. I. p. 108.

§ Peter of Sicily says, p. 6: χαλιπὸν τὸ μὴ συαρπασθῆναι μὴν κίτην τοὺς ἀπλουστέρους, δέτι πάντα τὰ τοῦ εἰσαγγείλου καὶ τοῦ ἀποστόλου λόγην διαλίγεται.

|| So Peter of Sicily reproaches him for leading astray many monks, priests, and Levites. See p. 62.

¶ Photius, I. 21, p. 115, cites the words only thus far; but the epithet,

for though I may be absent in the body, yet I am with you in the spirit.”\* And to the same community at Colonia in Armenia he writes: “Even as the primitive communities received their shepherds and teachers, so you also have received the illuminating torch, the clear-shining light, the guide-post to salvation.”† He then quotes, in proof, Matt. vi. 22, which he probably understood somewhat as follows:—that by virtue of the soundness of the eye within them, of the sense for divine realities awakened in their minds, they had recognised and received him as the true light.

If we placed certain reliance on the reports of opponents, we should be compelled to believe that Sergius pushed his self-exaltation to the extreme of self-deification; for it is said that he called himself the Paraclete and the Holy Ghost. But accusations of this sort cannot be received without suspicion; for, to say nothing of the intrinsic improbability of the thing, it is plain, from those expressions of the Paulicians, in which men were disposed to find such predicates applied to Sergius, how widely remote from their obvious meaning was the way in which they were interpreted. The Paulicians were accused of praying in the name of Sergius, as of the Holy Spirit. They were accustomed, for example, to seal up and conclude their petition, with the phrase “The intercession of the Holy Spirit will be favourable to us.”‡ But assuredly in this formula, imitated after the words in Romans viii. 26, it is not Sergius who is designated by the name Holy Spirit; but either a mediating intercession of the Holy Spirit, as nearly related to the supreme God, is pre-supposed; or, according to St. Paul, the inward prayer of believing aspiration is considered as a prayer of the Holy Spirit himself, of the spirit of God dwelling in, and praying from, the hearts of believers.

which Sergius here applies to himself, is somewhat softened by its connection with what follows, which is to be found in Peter of Sicily, p. 64.

\* Μόδις ὑμᾶς ἐκετάνοη κατὰ μηδὲν τρόπον, ταύτας δὲ τὰς ἴαγγειλίας ἔχοντες παρὰ θεοῦ θαρρεῖτε, ἕμας γάρ πειπομένοι ὄντες ιν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν ἰγεάφαμεν ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὁ θεοῦ δρός καὶ ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς καὶ ὁδηγὸς τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ὁ λύχνος τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ θεοῦ ἵγια εἰμι καὶ μισθὸν εἰμι πάσας· οὐδὲ ημίκρας ἔως τῆς συντιλίας τοῦ αἰάνος. Εἰ γάρ καὶ τῷ σώματι ἀπειψα, ἀλλὰ τῷ τινιμάται σὺν ὑμῖν εἰμι λοιπὸν χαιρετε, καταρτίζεσθε καὶ διδεῖτε τῆς εἰσήνης ἔσται μιθὸν ὑμῶν.

† He calls himself λαυταῦδα φανῆν, λύχνον φανοντα.

‡ Ἡ εἰδὴ τοῦ ἀγίου πνεύματος ἐλίσσει ἡμάς. Phut. I. 114.

If, then, there is any ground for the assertion that Sergius set himself up as the Holy Spirit, and the Paraclete,\* it could only amount to this, that Sergius represented himself, not as the Holy Spirit, but as the Paraclete; while his opponents, making no distinction between the two, misinterpreted the language of Sergius, as if he understood the Paraclete to be the same as the Holy Spirit. The truth was, however, that he distinguished these two forms of expression; and by the Paraclete he understood, like Mani, an enlightened teacher promised by Christ, who should separate the doctrines taught by him from all foreign mixtures, and open their true sense; and as such a teacher he meant to be regarded himself. But as Sergius did not think himself to be the first or the only reformer of a corrupted Christianity, and therefore could not have called himself, in this sense, the promised Paraclete, by whom believers were to be first led to the consciousness of divine truth, freed from all elements of error; we must suppose that, while he recognised the earlier teachers of the Paulicians in their capacity as teachers, he still designated himself as the great teacher whom Christ promised, and by whom a reformation was to be effected in the entire church, and that he subordinated them, as his fore-runners, to himself. We might trace this in his designating them as simply *ποιμένας καὶ διδασκάλους* (pastors and teachers), while he calls himself the resplendent lamp (*λάμπας φαειή*), the shining light (*λύχνος φαίρων*), the light-giving star (*λυχνοφέρης αστήρ*).† But opposed to this view is the fact that he represented the apostle Paul as the great teacher, by whom alone Christianity was to be exhibited in its true light; that, compared to Paul, he placed himself only on a level with Tychicus, and that he aspired at nothing higher than to be an ambassador and disciple of St. Paul, holding forth not the doctrines of his own wisdom, but those of his master.‡ It is, then, the most pro-

\* See Phot. I. I. p. 111.

† Ibid. Ψ. 98.

‡ "Α διαγγέλλει μὴ τῆς ἀντοῦ σοφίας ἔναι, τοῦ δὲ διδέξαντος καὶ ἀπεσάλποτος Παύλου παραγγέλλειται. Photius himself notices the inconsistency of Sergius, in assuming such lofty epithets, and yet representing himself as standing in this subordinate relation to St. Paul. It offers the following, not very natural, explanation. Sergius, he says, spoke of himself in the latter way when addressing the Exoterics, or persons who were yet to be gained over to the sect; and, in the former, in addressing those who were already initiated into the mysteries. See I. I. p. 111.

bable supposition that Sergius did not wish to be regarded as either the Paraclete or the Holy Spirit; but that certain expressions, in which he represented himself as the organ of the Holy Spirit, or as a Paraclete for the restoration of pure Christianity, led, by a misconception of their import, to the above-mentioned false accusations.\*

The active labours of Sergius fell within a period which at first was favourable to their success. It was when the Greek emperor Nicephorus, who reigned near the beginning of the ninth century, refused to be employed as a tool of the hierarchy for the persecution of the Paulicians; but promised them, particularly in Phrygia and Lycania, freedom and security in the exercise of their religious faith.† It may be doubted whether this emperor was determined to this milder treatment of the Paulicians by his impatience of the domination of the clergy,‡ or by different principles from those which ordinarily prevailed respecting the proper mode of dealing with false teachers; for it is certain that at this time there was in the Greek church a better-disposed minority, who considered it an unchristian procedure to persecute heretics with the sword; and who declared it contrary to the vocation of priests to be the occasion of blood-shed, it being their duty simply to lead the erring, if possible, to repentance. It was this minority who, when Michael Curopalates, the next emperor, was induced, by the influence of Nicephorus, patriarch of Constantinople, to threaten these heretics with the punishment of the sword, endeavoured, by arguments of this kind, to avert the

This far-fetched explanation is at once refuted by the fact, that all these epithets are undoubtedly taken from epistles of Sergius addressed to *entire communities*.

\* Some such misconception probably gave occasion also to the anathema which is to be found among those directed against the Bogomiles, or Euchites; if by Tychicus, there mentioned, we are to understand Sergius. He is there accused of applying what is said in Scripture of God the Father, and of the Holy Spirit, to his own spiritual father, to one of the Coryphaeuses of this sect, and of perverting the language as follows: Τυχίκη, τῷ . . . ας τὰς περὶ τοῦ Ιησοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἵτι δι καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἄ; οὐ γνώματος φίσις οὐ τὸς πινακατικὸν αὐτοῦ πατρίκα παρεργάνισατι. See Jacob. Tollii insignia itinerarii Italici, p. 114.

† See Theophanes Chronograph. f. 413, ed. Paris.

‡ Though we are never warranted to place any reliance on the stories told by the Byzantine historians, his bitter enemies, concerning his connection with the Paulicians.

execution of the order.\* And one of the most zealous defenders of the church faith, and fanatical supporters of image-worship, Theodore, abbot of the students' monastery at Constantinople, may be considered the representative of this Christianly-disposed minority.† To Theophilus, a bishop of Ephesus, who had declared that to kill the Manichæans was a glorious work, he writes, “What sayest thou ?‡—Our Lord has forbidden this in the gospels (Matt. xiii. 29), lest in rooting out the tares the wheat might be gathered up with them. Let both grow together until the harvest. How then canst thou call the rooting up of the tares a glorious work ?” He then quotes, in confirmation of his views, a fine passage from the homilies of Chrysostom on the gospel of Matthew;§ after which he goes on to say: “Nor ought we to pray *against* the teachers of error: much rather are we bound to pray *for* them, as our Lord, when on the cross, prayed for those who knew not what they did. At this late day men should no longer appeal to the examples of Phineas and of Elijah; for it was necessary to distinguish the different stages of the Old and of the New Testament:—and when the disciples would have acted in that spirit (against the Samaritans), Christ expressed his displeasure that they should depart so far from that meek and gentle spirit, whose disciples they ought to have been.” Citing the passage in 2 Tim. ii. 25, he remarks: “We ought not to punish, but to instruct, the ignorant. Rulers, indeed, bear not the sword in vain; but neither do they bear it to be used against those, against whom our Lord had forbidden it to be used. *Their* dominion is over the outward man; and it is incumbent on them to punish those who are found guilty of crimes against the outward man. But *their* power of punishing has no reference to what is purely inward—this belongs exclusively to their province who have the cure of

\* The chroographer Theophanes, who mentions the fact, p. 419, charges those who maintained this ground with being altogether at variance with the sacred Scriptures. To prove this, he cites the example of Peter, who caused the death of Ananias and Sapphira merely for a falsehood; of Paul, who says, Röm. i. 32, they who do such things are worthy of death, though he is here speaking only of sins of the flesh. Ηλος οὖν οντος αὐτῶν οὐν εἰ τούς οὐσίας ψυχικῆς καὶ σωματικῆς ἀκαθαρτούς ιμπλέους καὶ διμόνων λατρείας ὑπάρχοντας λυτρεύμενοι τοῦ ξίφους.

† Of this remarkable man we shall have more to say in the following volume. ‡ In his Letters, II. 155. § Hor. XLVII.

souls, and these can only threaten spiritual punishments, such, for example, as exclusion from the fellowship of the church."\*

Yet such individual voices could avail nothing against the dominant spirit. Iconoclasts and image-worshippers concurred in the adoption of persecuting measures against these sects, which, in the meanwhile, continued to increase and spread, as was apparent under the successors of Nicephorus, the emperors Michael Curopalates (Rhängabe) and Leo the Armenian. The common zeal manifested by himself and those heretics against image-worship could not move the emperor Leo the Armenian to adopt any milder measures against the Paulicians; but perhaps he was desirous of proving his zeal for the pure doctrines of the church by persecuting that obstinate sect. Thomas, bishop of Neo-Cæsarea in Cappadocia, and the abbot Paracondaces, were appointed inquisitors over the Paulicians. Those who manifested repentance were to be placed in the hands of the bishops for the purpose of being instructed and reconciled to the church; the rest were to be put to the sword. The cruelty with which these inquisitors executed their commission provoked the Paulicians who resided in the city of Cynoschora in Armenia,† to a conspiracy against them, by which both were cut off. After this the Paulicians fled to the parts of Armenia subject to the Saracens, by whom they were received in a friendly manner, as enemies of the Roman empire. The Saracens assigned to their use a town called Argam.‡ The favourable reception which these had met with, and the persecutions in the Roman empire, induced a constantly-increasing multitude to take refuge in the same parts; and Sergius also, their leader, fixed his residence in this place. Here they gradually formed a considerable

\* Συμάτων γὰρ δέχοται, τοὺς ἐν τοῖς σωματικοῖς ἀλόντας ἵξεν αὐτος κολαζεῖν, οὐχὶ τοὺς ἐν τῷ (it should read οὐχὶ τοὺς ἐν τῷ;) κατὰ ψυχὴν τῶν γὰρ ψυχῶν δέχοντας τοῦτο, ἀν τὰ κολαστήρια ἀφορισμοὶ καὶ αἱ λοιπαὶ ἐπιτιμίαι. See f. 497.

† Οἱ λεγόμενοι Κυνοχωρῆται, Phot. I. p. 128. Οἱ καποικοῦντες κοινὸς τὴν χώραν, Petr. Sicul. p. 66, which communities are designated by Sergius as the Laodicean.

‡ Ἀργασῶν, perhaps Arcas, see Gieseler, l. c. p. 94, unless the fact was that this town, which is described as lying on a mountain, received its name from the mountain Argeus, and is one not elsewhere mentioned. The inhabitants are called by Petrus Siculus, Ἀργασῶται. To this community Sergius gives the name of Colossians. Petr. Sic. p. 66.

force ; and, making inroads into the Roman provinces, dragged away many as captives, whom they endeavoured to make proselytes. Sergius disapproved of this, and endeavoured to dissuade his people from the practice ; but his advice was disregarded. He could testify that he had neither part nor lot in all this calamity. Often had he exhorted them not to make prisoners of the Romans : they refused to hear him.\* After having pursued his labours here for several years, Sergius, while employed alone on one of the adjacent mountains, felling timber for his carpenter's trade, was attacked by a certain Tzanio of Nicopolis, a fierce zealot for the church-doctrine, and assassinated, A.D. 835.†

In reference to the *doctrines of the Paulicians*, the two only sources of information furnish but very meagre accounts ; and from these it is impossible to form anything like a complete and well-defined notion of their character. As writers assumed that the Paulicians descended from the Manichæans, the mode of understanding and representing their doctrines would easily be made to wear a false colour of Manichæism. Their system was certainly founded on dualistic principles ; the creation of the sensible world, for example, was referred only to the evil principle, which they are said to have represented as the Demiurge. But since, in all the older Gnostic systems, the Creator of the world was considered a distinct being from the evil principle, while, in the Paulician system, the Demiurge, as the principle of evil, was opposed to the kingdom of the supreme and perfect God, it may be doubted whether this distinction between the Creator of the world and the evil principle was really held by them. The doctrine of the Paulicians, as it is described,‡ viz., that the evil spirit, or the Demiurge, sprang into existence out of darkness and fire, may doubtless have some reference to such a distinction ; for this two-fold nature presupposes two elements, whose combination formed the essence of the Demiurge — darkness, the proper principle of evil, and fire, the principle of the sidereal world, both opposed to the spiritual life ; as in the Clementines,

\* Ἐγὼ τῶν πακῶν τούτων ἀναίτιος εἰμι, πολλὰ γὰρ παρῆγελλον αὐτοῖς, οὐ τοῦ αἰχμαλωτίζειν τοὺς ῥωμαίους ἀποστῆναι, καὶ οὐχ' ὑπήκουσάν μοι. Petr. Sic. 62.

† See, respecting the chronology, Gieseler's remarks in the above-mentioned Essay, p. 100. ‡ Phot. II. 3.

and in the doctrine of the Tzabeans, or disciples of John. Thus the Paulicians, like Marcion, may have supposed three fundamental principles, or two absolute fundamental principles, and a middle one. At all events, they themselves considered the distinction between a Demiurge, the author of the sensible creation, and the perfect God, from whom nothing proceeds but the spiritual world, and who cannot reveal himself in the world of sense, as the characteristic mark of their sect as compared with the Catholic church; for they accused the latter of confounding together the Demiurge and the perfect God, and of worshipping the former only. In their disputes with Catholic Christians they said to them, You believe in the Creator of the world; but we believe in him of whom our Lord says: "Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his shape," after the manner in which the Creator of the world revealed himself in the Old Testament (John v. 37).\* Photius says,† "that the Paulicians did not all in like manner exclude the perfect God from participating in the work of creation. Some ascribed to the good God the creation of the heavens; to the evil principle the creation of the earth, and of all that exists betwixt the heavens and the earth; others considered the heavens themselves as a work of the Demiurge." It is probable, then, that the Paulicians affirmed or denied that the perfect God was the Creator of the heavens according to the different senses which they attached to that word. If by heaven was meant the visible firmament, the starry heaven, this the Paulicians reckoned as belonging to the creation and kingdom of the Demiurge, and opposed to it the creation and the kingdom of the perfect God. But if by heaven was meant the spiritual heaven, beyond the sidereal world, the region of things divine, this they regarded as a creation and kingdom of the perfect God. The good God and the Demiurge had each his own appropriate heaven.‡ We may thus account for it, that Photius, by neglecting to distinguish the different senses of the term "heaven" in the Paulician system, mistook a different mode of expression for a difference of opinions. But

\* See Pet. Sic. p. 16.

† II. 5.

‡ According to the statement of Marcion's doctrine by the Armenian bishop Eznig, of the fifth century, which Professor Neumann has translated in Illigen's *Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie* IV. B. I. Stück, the perfect God has his seat in the third heavens.

at the same time, it is probable that a difference of opinions really existed within the sect at an early period ; growing out of the more or less decided manner in which the dualistic system was received, just as we find that different opinions were entertained on this point among kindred sects of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. According to the Paulician system, the corporeal world proceeded wholly from the Demiurge, who formed it out of matter, the source of all evil ; but the soul of man is of divine origin, containing in it a germ of life akin to the essence of the supreme God. Thus human nature consists of two opposite principles ; but *this union* of the soul with a body foreign to it by nature in which all the sensual passions have their root—this banishment of the soul into a sensible world, which fetters and confines its higher essence—a world which has proceeded from an entirely different creator—this cannot have been the work of the supreme and perfect God. It can only be the work of that enemy, the Demiurge, who seeks to bring down the divine germs of life into his own kingdom, and there hold them fast. Such being the Paulician system of the universe, we must suppose they had a corresponding theory of the origin and nature of man. Either starting with the doctrine of a pre-existence of souls, they must have held that the Demiurge was constantly drawing away these souls from the higher world to which they properly belonged, and confining them in this material world ; or, like the older Syrian Gnostics, they must have held that the Demiurge had, at the beginning, charmed the divine germs of life into the phenomenal forms of the first man, a being created after some image of the higher world that hovered before him—which germs of life now proceeded to develop themselves in humanity, giving birth to human souls. An important source of our knowledge respecting the opinion of Sergius on this point is contained in a fragment of one of his letters preserved by Photius and Peter the Sicilian, but which, unfortunately, in the mutilated state in which it has come to us, is extremely obscure. “The *first* fornication, in which from Adam downward we are all ensnared, is a benefit ; but the *second* is greater (namely a greater fornication or sin), of which St. Paul says : ‘He that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body’ (1 Cor. vi. 18).\* To understand the

\* Ἡ πρώτη περια, ἡντε τοῦ Ἀδὰμ περιπάτεια, περιγραφία, ἡ δὲ διατίπα

real meaning of Sergius in these singular words we must take them in connection with what he afterwards writes, though not in this immediate context.\* From remarks that afterwards occur, we find that Sergius here interprets the term *πορνεία* (fornication), in a spiritual sense, as denoting the fall from the supreme God, from the true body of Christ, i. e. the fall from the true Christian church, subsisting among the Paulicians, and from the purely Christian doctrines handed down in that sect; the falling back into the corrupt church, which belongs to the Demiurge. Now if the whole should, in like manner, be interpreted spiritually, we must understand what is said of Adam's *πορνεία* in the same sense; and since Adam's disloyalty to the supreme God could be in no way a benefit either to him or to his posterity, even according to the system of Sergius, this disloyalty can only mean a rebellion against the Demiurge. And we should then have the following train of ideas: the Demiurge endeavoured to hold the first man in complete bondage. He was not to come to any consciousness of his higher nature, lest he should begin to aspire after something beyond the kingdom of the Demiurge. Hence the command which forbade him to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. But Adam was disobedient; and this disobedience of his, this *πορνεία*, by which he broke his bond of servitude to the Demiurge, was the cause whereby he and his race attained to the consciousness of their higher nature, transcending the kingdom of the Demiurge; and, therefore, we might rightly describe it as a benefit, since it was the necessary preparation for the redemption, afterwards to follow. Still, however the phrase *περικείμεθα τὴν πορνείαν* (we are enveloped in the fornication) does not seem to harmonize so well with this spiritual mode of explanation; inasmuch as the phrase denotes something that is worn about, or that cleaves to the person. We should have to understand it, then, metonymically. The consequences of this "fornication" of the first man, which turned out to be a benefit to him and to his posterity, passed over to us: which, however, would

μεῖζων ιστ', περὶ δὲ λόγου καὶ ὁ Ἀπόστολος ὁ παρνέων εἰς τὸ θίου σῶμα ἀμαρτάνει. See Phot I. p. 117. Petr. Sicul. p. 68.

\* The words: ἡμῖς ἡμέν σώμα χειροῦ εἰς τις δὲ ἀφίσταται τῶν παραδόσιων τοῦ σώματος τοῦ χειροῦ, τουτίστι τῶν ἡμῶν, ἀμαρτάνει, ὅτι προστέχει τοῖς ἀπεριδικηλοῦσι καὶ ἀπειθεῖ τοῖς ὑγιαίνοντος λογοῖς.

not be a very natural interpretation of the words. Nor, in strict propriety, are we bound or warranted to explain everything spiritually in order to meet the sense of Sergius; for however forced and tortuous the methods of allegorizing interpretation which we may expect to find in writers of this class, still it could hardly be supposed, even of Sergius, that he would understand those words of St. Paul as, by themselves considered, denoting spiritual fornication. This would be too preposterous. Most probably he understood the words in the first place literally—as warning against “fornication” in the proper sense—a warning which would not appear superfluous even to those strict upholders of moral purity, the Paulicians.\* But then, in conformity with the principles of the allegorizing mode of interpretation, he added a spiritual exposition of the ~~same~~ words, as denoting the fall from pure doctrine, a spiritual “fornication.”†

By these remarks we might be led to infer that Adam’s *πορνεία* also, refers primarily to that of the body. We might then understand him as follows: Sergius considered the carnal connection of Adam and Eve as a *πορνεία*, as the eating of the forbidden fruit; which sin, however, was still a benefit, since it led to the evolution and the multiplied individualization of the germ of divine life in humanity. Or we must suppose, that he considered the union of the soul with a body formed out of matter, as a *πορνεία*; in which case, the connection of thought would be as follows: The Demiurge succeeded in enticing a heavenly soul down into the corporeal world; and from this sprung all other human souls. This soul was the mother of all spiritual life in humanity. Now since, according to this view, as well as the other, the spiritual life in humanity was evolved to multiplied and manifold individuality, and since by this means also the way was prepared for the destruction of the kingdom of the Demiurge, this *πορνεία* might be regarded as a benefit. The phrase *περικείμεθα*

\* It is manifestly perverting the language of Servius, to infer from it, as Petrus Siculus does, that Servius did not consider the *πορνεία* to be a sin, but sought to justify it. We see from this example, what reason we have to be cautious in admitting all that is said against the Paulicians.

† It should be borne in mind, that Petrus Siculus after citing the first words, says, *ιτάγεις λίγως*, therefore does not cite the words in their entire connection, but has left out something intervening.

*τὴν πορνείαν* certainly agrees peculiarly well with this explanation; for the “enveloping of the soul with the body,” repeated at the birth of every man, might thus be described as a *περικισθαι τὴν πορνείαν*.

The assumption of an original relationship of the soul to God, constitutes an essential difference, very important in its consequences, between the Paulician and the strictly Marcionite doctrine. Hence the Paulicians held to an enduring connection between these souls originally related to God, and the supreme God, from whom they sprung,—a connection not to be dissolved by the power of the Demiurge. They supposed an original revelation of God, implicitly contained in every soul banished into the creation of the Demiurge—a power of reaction against the Demiurge’s influence. The God of the spiritual world enlightens every man that comes into this world;—so they explained the words in the introduction to John’s gospel.\* To this, doubtless, they referred all manifestations of the sense of truth in human nature. It depends on man’s will, whether to yield himself up to the power of sin, and so continually to depress the germ of divine life in his soul, or to follow out that awakening revelation of God, and so unfold to every increasing freedom and power the germ of divine life within him. But however low man may sink, still, by virtue of his nature thus related to God, he cannot be utterly dispossessed of that eternal revelation of God. The enemy—say the Paulicians—has not so completely enthralled even the souls of those who have voluntarily abandoned themselves to his power, that their darkened minds are left without the power of ever turning to a ray from the light of truth; for the good God always was, is, and shall be; there can never be a time in which he may not reveal himself.†

We may easily gather, from what has been said, that the doctrine of redemption would hold an important place in the Paulician system. Single rays of the revelation of the incom-

\* See Photius I. II. p. 169.

† Photius I. II. c. 3. Οὐδὲ γὰρ εἰδίστω πατειράτην εἰδὲ τῶν ἴσχυρῶν πρεσβύτων ιαυτούς τῆς Φυχῆς ὁ Ἰχθεός, ὃς μηδαμῆ πρὸς μηδεμίαν δῆλος τῆς ἀληθείας αἴγαλην τους ἴσκοτοιμένους ἵπποτριφισθεῖ, ὅτι ὁ αἴγαλος θεός ἦν εἰς καὶ ιστι καὶ θεται.

## DOCTRINES OF THE PAULICIANS.

prehensible God,\* falling upon the darkness of souls held bound in the kingdom of the Demiurge, would not suffice to raise their imprisoned souls to perfect communion with the Supreme Being, and to perfect freedom. The good God must reveal himself in some better way to mankind, in order to prepare them for communion with himself, and to release them from the dominion of the Demiurge. This was done by the Redeemer. Of the views entertained by the Paulicians respecting the person and nature of Christ, no exact accounts have, indeed, been preserved; but thus much is certain, they taught that he came down as a heavenly being, from the heaven of the good God, from that higher world which is the source and fountain of all divine life,—the celestial city of God,—and that he ascended again, after having completed his work on earth, to his heavenly abode, for the purpose of placing the faithful in union with the same.† The doctrine of the Paulicians touching matter, and the material body, would not allow them to attribute to our Saviour a body of this earthly material, since this would be inconsistent with his perfect impeccability, and since the divine cannot enter into any sort of fellowship with the kingdom of darkness. Still they did not fall into absolute Docetism; but, like the Valentinians, they seem to have ascribed to our Saviour a body resembling the earthly only in appearance, a body of higher stuff, which he brought with him from heaven, and with which he passed through Mary as through a channel, without receiving any portion of it from her.‡ And here we must remember, that the native country of the Paulicians was Armenia. Now, in the Armenian church, Monophysitism was the predominant faith, but the system was understood and received in two different ways. It had its moderate and its extreme party. The former made use of the following formulary: Christ subsists of two natures; and they taught that by virtue of the actual union of the two natures, it was necessary to suppose in him but one nature, as well as one person—the one nature of the incarnate Logos;—and by so doing, they were enabled to distinguish without separating the divine and human predicates,

\* It is described as the *άόρατος* and *άκαταληπτος*. Phot. II. 147.

† Hence the expression: ἡ πανάγια Σιοτόκος, ή η σιρηλθιν και έγηλθιν κύριος.

‡ Δι' αὐτῆς ὡς διὰ σωλῆνος διεληλυθίαν. Phot. I. 7.

intimately united in this one nature—and in this way to approximate somewhat more nearly to the Catholic system of faith. On the contrary, the followers of the other, ultra-Monophysite view, on account of their extreme statements, particularly their Aphtharto-Docetism, were charged by the other party with embracing Docetic errors.\* They feared to concede a resemblance of essence between the body of Christ and other human bodies;—to ascribe to the Redeemer *passiones secundum carnem sive per carnem*.† They would not say: *ex virgine incarnatus*, but *in virgine*.‡ Now, in these ultra-Monophysite forms of phraseology, the doctrine of the Paulicians concerning the person of Christ might easily find a point of attachment.

Nor had the Paulicians, in this view of the matter, any inducement or occasion to fall in with the worship of Mary; on the other hand, they must have felt themselves more imperiously called upon to combat it, in proportion as a superstition so hateful to them became attached to this theory. To turn away their opponents from this object of idolatrous veneration, they appealed to those passages of the gospel history which seem to intimate that Mary bore other sons after the birth of Jesus,§ a kind of argument which, if they considered marriage intercourse and the begetting of children irreconcilable with perfect holiness, must have been considered decisive, at their own point of view. Peter the Sicilian says,|| they were so spiteful against Mary as not to allow her a place even among the good and virtuous. From this we may infer, that they resorted to various passages of the gospel history for the purpose of setting the religious character of Mary, for example, the weakness of her faith, in an unfavourable light.

Entertaining such notions as they did of the nature of Christ's body, the Paulicians could not, of course, suppose that it was capable of being affected by any kind of suffering. Christ, by virtue of his divine dignity, was raised above

\* See the tract of John Oznensis against these ultra-Monophysites: *Joannes Oznensis contra phantasticos*, p. 111.

† L. c. Ne forte duas naturas in uno Christo innuere videamur, sed ipsummet verbum divinum erat, quod utraque tum humana tum divina ostibat.

‡ L. c. § Phot. I. 22.

|| Pag. 18. Μηδὶ καὶ ἡ σλῆ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀνθεάπτων τάπτειν ἀπιχθῶς ἀπασιθυμοῦ.

suffering. In all probability, they taught that the Demiurge, finding that the life and labours of Christ threatened destruction to his kingdom, incited his servants to crucify him; but that his purpose was frustrated, because Christ, by virtue of the higher nature of his body, was secure against all outward injury. Perhaps, however, like the Manichæans, they at the same time ascribed a symbolical import to the crucifixion of Christ,—holding that Christ, with his divine life, descended into the kingdom of the Demiurge, and diffused himself through it. This would appear probable, from the fact that the Paulicians were always ready to venerate the cross as a symbol of Christ, stretching forth his hands in the form of the cross.\* But the *sufferings* of Christ could, according to their doctrine, have contributed nothing to the work of redemption; nor is it indeed probable that the idea of God's punitive justice, which required that Christ should suffer, had any place in their system. They were opposed to the worship of the cross, the worship of a mere bit of wood, an instrument of punishment for malefactors,†—the sign of a curse, Gal. iii. 13. Nothing of this sort could have been said by the Paulicians, in case they received the doctrine of Christ's redemptive sufferings.

They were for restoring the life and manners of the ~~church~~ to apostolic simplicity. They maintained that by the ~~multi-~~ plication of external rites and ceremonies in the ~~dominant~~ church, the true life of religion had declined. They combated the inclination to rely on the magical effects of external forms, particularly the sacraments. Indeed, they went so far on this side as wholly to reject the outward celebration of the sacraments. They maintained that it was by no means Christ's intention to institute the baptism by water as a perpetual ordinance, but that by baptism he meant only the baptism of the Spirit, for by his teachings he communicated him-

\* Καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς εἰς σταυροῦ σταῦρον τὰς χεῖρας ἔπειρεντος, and in the Anathemas published by J. Tollius, the Paulicians are described as *νοῦντες αὐτὸν σταυροῦ τὸν χριστὸν, ὡς λεπιδίας, φασὶ, τὰς χεῖρας τὸν σταυροῦ τύπον δινχάραξι*. Insignia itiner. Ital. p. 144.

† The expression *κακουργῶν ὄγκαν*, in Photius (I. c. 7. p. 23), is obscure. Properly it should mean an instrument used by bad men. Thus, they who threaten others with such tortures, would be considered as the *κακουργοί*; but this does not give so good a sense, as when we take it elliptically to mean an instrument for the punishment of evil doers.

self, as the living water, for the thorough cleansing of the entire human nature.\* So, too, they held that the eating of the flesh and drinking of the blood of Christ consisted simply in the coming into vital union with him through his doctrines, his words, which were his true flesh and blood. It was not sensible bread and sensible wine, but his words, which were to be the same for the soul that bread and wine are for the body, which he designated as his flesh and blood.† Yet, if we may credit the report of Photius,‡ the Paulicians, when attacked by any serious illness, were in the habit of lacing upon themselves a cross of wood, which, when they recovered, they threw aside. Nor can there be any doubt that they allowed their children to be baptized by priests who lived among them as captives; though they affirmed that all this might profit the body but not the soul. If this be so, we must try to reconcile it with the doctrines of the Paulicians in some such way as follows.§ They heard a great deal said of the wonderful efficacy of the cross, and of baptism in the healing of diseases. Many of the uneducated Paulicians may have witnessed with their own eyes appearance of this sort, which they attributed to causes that had no existence. Now as they ascribed to the Demiurge a power over the sensible world, so they might say here, as perhaps also in the case of the pretended miracles of the saints, that these outward works, performed by the servants of the Demiurge, possessed a virtue from him which extended to the relief of the body; though it could not reach the inner life, which lay beyond the Demiurge's province. But even if we admit that Photius does not report in this story a blind rumour, yet we must doubtless understand what he says as true only of individuals, and uneducated persons, who in the hour of distress were involuntarily governed once more by the ancient faith; at any rate, it is impossible to derive from his language any connected theory applying to the conduct of the Paulicians generally.

They undoubtedly considered the confounding together of Christian, Jewish, and political elements as the cause of the

\* Phot. B. 9.

† Ibid., Petr. Sic. 18, "Οτι οὐκ ἦν ἀρτος καὶ οἶνος, ἐν ὁ κίνειος ἴδεον τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ἦτι τοῦ διάτρου, ἀλλα συμβολικῶς τὰ ἥματα αὐτοῖς ἴδεον, ἐν ἄρτον καὶ οἶνον.

‡ I. c. 9. p. 29.

§ In like manner Gieseler.

corruptions of the dominant church ; they were desirous of bringing back the simplicity of the Apostolic church ; hence they styled themselves the Catholic church, Christians, *χριστοπολῖται*,\* as contradistinguished from the professors of the Roman state religion (*ρωμαῖοις*). They strove to follow the pattern of apostolic simplicity in all their ordinances, and carefully avoided everything that approached to a resemblance of Jewish or pagan rites. Hence they never called their places of assembly temples (*νάοι* or *ἴερα*), which suggested the image of Jewish or pagan temples ; but gave them the more unpretending name of oratories (*προσευχαῖ*.),† from which, too, we may gather, that with them prayer constituted the most essential part of divine worship. Among other corruptions of the Christian element, they certainly counted also the Christian priesthood, founded on the pattern of that of the Old Testament. They recognised it as belonging to the peculiar essence of Christianity, that it aimed to establish a higher fellowship of life among men of all ranks and classes, tolerating no such distinctions as the existing ones between clergy or priests and laity. They had among them, it is true, persons who administered ecclesiastical offices, but these like the rest were to be looked upon as members of the communities. They were distinguished from others neither by dress, nor by any other outward mark.‡ The names, also, of their church officers were so chosen as to denote the peculiarity of their vocation, which was to administer the office of spiritual teaching, to the exclusion of all sacerdotal prerogatives. Hence they rejected the name *ἱερεῖς* and also *πρεσβύτεροι*, since even this latter was too Jewish for them, suggesting to their minds the presbyters of the Jewish sanhedrim assembled for the condemnation of Christ.§ At the head of the sect stood the general teachers and reformers, awakened by the Spirit of God, such as Constantine and Sergius. These were distinguished by the title

\* The name *χριστοπολῖται* in the Anathemas of the Euchites in Tollius, p. 122. † Phot. I. 9.

‡ Phot. I. p. 31. Οὗτοι σχῆματι, οὗτοι διαίτῃ, ρῦτε τοῖς ἄλλῳ τοῖς πάντα βίου σημάτεσσιν ἵττιλοῦνται τὸ διάφορον αὐτῶν πρὸς τὸ πλῆθος ἵττιλικυνται.

§ Phot. I. p. 31. Διότι τὸ κατὰ χριστοῦ συνέδεσμον οἱ ἱεροὶ καὶ πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ συνιστάσαντο. Petrus Siculus names (p. 20) among the peculiarities of the Paulicians, Τὸ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους τῆς ἵκλινος ἀπορεῖσθαι, οἵτινες εἰ προσέντεροι κατὰ τοῦ κυρίου συνήκησαν καὶ διὰ τούτο εἰ χρεῖται.

of apostles or prophets. Sergius counts four of them.\* Next followed the class called διδάσκαλοι and ποιμένες (teachers and pastors); then the itinerant messengers of the faith, συνέκδημοι, — companions of those divinely illuminated heads over the entire sect, trained under their influence, and regarded as living organs for the communication of the spirit which proceeded from them: next, the νοτάριοι, copyists, probably so called,† because it was their business to multiply and disseminate the religious records which embodied the doctrines of the sect; for they considered it as a matter of the greatest moment that all under the enlightening influences of the divine Spirit should have it in their power to draw directly from the genuine records of the doctrines of Christ; and it is probable that on these notaries devolved more especially the duty of expounding the Scriptures. As no other individual, after the death of Sergius, attained to such eminence of authority as to enjoy the confidence of all as a prophet called to guide the whole community, so it was his immediate disciples, the συνέκδημοι (associate itinerants), who, in the possession of an equal authority, now took the first place in the general superintendence of the sect. To these latter, the preservers and expounders of the written word were originally subordinate.‡ But at a later period, when the generation of those immediate disciples and bearers of the Spirit were removed by death, the notaries, who had most carefully studied the written records of the religion, in search of a rule for the trying of spirits, and who were most practised in expounding their sense, acquired the highest authority. Subordinate to the learned in the Scriptures, were those who only spoke by immediate inspiration. The knowledge obtained by the study of the religious records stood in higher repute than immediate inspiration without such knowledge.§ In addition to these officers, we find a class called ἀστατοι, the meaning of which term cannot be so exactly determined. The word reminds us of ἀστα-

\* Photius, p. 116.

† Gieseler aptly compares them with the γραμματεῖς of the New Testament.

‡ Phot. I. c. 25, p. 134.

§ In the Anathemas in Tollius, p. 144, Ων (συνέκδημοι) οἱ προσεδμιώτεροι Νοτάριοι κατονομαζόμενοι τὴν τῶν βούλυκτῶν Ὁργίαν ἴντεχειρίζονται.

*τειν*, in 1 Cor. iv. 1, from which probably it was formed, to denote the life of missionaries, travelling from one place to another and exposed to manifold persecutions. Hence we may gather, that this title was employed to designate a higher class of the *συνέκδημοι*. This accords perfectly with the account given of them by Photius,\* who says they were the *elect* portion of the disciples of Sergius.† One of them led the Cynochorites in the above mentioned conspiracy against the emperor's commissioners; but in so doing he certainly departed from the principles of his master.

In respect to the morality of the Paulicians, we find that their opponents—among whom may be reckoned Johannes Ozniensis†—accuse them of allowing themselves in unnatural lusts and incestuous connections. It is obvious to remark, however, that little reliance can be placed on such accusations coming from the mouths of excited adversaries. Such bad reports concerning the religious meetings of sects accounted heretical are to be met with in every age of the church. Nor was there wanting in the present case the no less ~~common~~ charge of infanticide, and of magical rites performed with the blood of children. We have already observed how a single phrase, found in a letter of Sergius, was so misconceived or intentionally perverted, as to make it appear that he ~~considered~~ fornication (*πορνεία*) to be a trifling sin. In like manner the contempt of the Paulicians for the laws of the Old Testament respecting hindrances to marriage, grounded ~~on~~ certain degrees of relationship, may have been the sole *réason* of their being accused of denying that any degree of consanguinity constituted a valid obstacle to marriage. We must certainly admit, however, that the Paulicians were liable to be so ~~far~~ misled by their contempt of the Demiurge's laws, as to despise the delicate scruples of a pure moral sentiment on this subject.§ Yet we should consider again that the opponents themselves of the Paulicians distinguish Baanes, whose principles were here notoriously loose, and his followers, from the rest of the Paulicians; that Sergius took decided ground, as a reformer, against the pernicious influence of Baanes; that the opponents themselves of the Paulicians acknowledged the pure

\* P. 128.

† L. c. p. 85.

† Τοῦ τοῦ Σεργίου μαθητῶν οἱ λογισταί.

§ As Gieseler remarks.

moral spirit of Sergius, though, after their usual manner, they represented the whole thing as hypocritical pretence. And though it may have been true with regard to a part of the Armenian Paulicians, as intimated by Johannes Ozuiensis, in the passage we have referred to, that among them the principles of Parsism co-operated with the influence of Baanes, yet this cannot be charged as a fault belonging to the whole sect. Certain it is that the Paulician doctrines, as a whole, not only required, but were calculated to foster, a spirit of sober and strict morality; for the great practical principle which flowed directly from their theory was freedom for the repressed consciousness of God, deliverance to the divine germ of life, held imprisoned by the power of sense, so that it might proceed to unfold itself without let or hindrance. If immoral tendencies were to be found, it cannot be doubted that they were offshoots, growing out of a departure from the original spirit and tendency of the sect. Indeed, the more natural result from a principle like that above described would be, a rigidly ascetic system of morality, such as we find in earlier and later sects of a kindred character. No trace, however, is to be found, at least in the sources of information we possess, of the existence of such a system among the Paulicians; and perhaps they were led, by that spirit of practical Christianity which had been infused into their reformers by the study of the New Testament Scriptures, into a more free direction of life than was common among older sects of a kindred character. It is certain that they protested against the multiplied statutes and ordinances of the dominant Greek church. While in the latter the apostolic decrees concerning the eating of things strangled, &c., were held to be still obligatory, the Paulicians, on the contrary, refused to be bound by any such scruples, which they probably ascribed to Jewish prejudice. Hence they were accused of defiling themselves by the eating of things forbidden. They treated the church fasts with contempt, nor did they hesitate to use cheese and milk as food in such seasons of fasting as were observed by their sect.\*

\* Among the anathemas directed against the Paulicians, is the following (Tollius, pag. 146): *ἀνάθημα τοῖς τῇ βούσι τῶν Θηρῶν τῶν θνητομάσιων μολυνομένοις καὶ τοῖς πάσοις μὲν ἐκτρ.τορίνοις χριστιανικήν ποστίαν, κατὰ δὲ τὸν καιρὸν τὰς δικούσες αὐτοῖς πισταρακοστῆς τυρῶν τε καὶ γαλακτος ἡμφορεύματος.*

It was particularly objected to the Paulicians that they carried to the utmost extreme the principle of justifying falsehood when employed for righteous ends. Photius affirms that they denied their faith without the slightest scruple, and approved of such denial though a thousand times repeated.\* The ready equivocations resorted to by Gegnæsius, for the purpose of evading the confession of his faith at Constantinople,† may serve as an illustration of the laxity of their principles with regard to the duty of veracity. Indeed, we find nothing more common among theosophical sects than the practice of justifying falsehood when resorted to for the promotion of pious ends. But among such sects this principle is ever found connected with the assumption that only a certain class of superior natures are capable of attaining to the knowledge of pure truth. While Christianity, by founding a higher fellowship of life, on the basis of a common religious consciousness, as opposed to the distinction of the exoteric and esoteric in religion which prevailed before its appearance, had established a new principle of truthfulness, and deprived partial falsehood of the prop on which it had hitherto leaned for support, free room was still found for the old indulgence of prevarication, wherever that fundamental principle of Christian fellowship was lost sight of, and the separating walls in religion, thrown down by Christianity, had been re-erected. It cannot be said, however, of the Paulicians, that *they* denied Christianity its rights in this particular. In all men alike they recognised the repressed consciousness of God, the imprisoned germ of a divine life, the point of access for the message of the same divine truth which was meant for the acceptance of all. This they showed by their active zeal in propagating the doctrines of their sect. If, then, they gave great latitude to the principle that deception might be resorted to for the purpose of promoting God's glory, and advancing the truth, still they most assuredly acknowledged the general duty of testifying the truth, since on no other ground than as it served to advance the truth, could they defend their lax principle of accommodation.

We have noticed already the high value set by Paulicians on the written records of the truth. Among these, however,

\* I. 8, p. 25.

† See above, p. 344.

they did not reckon the Old Testament; for they derived Judaism from the Demiurge. To the religious teachers of the Old Testament they, like the older Gnostics, applied the words of our Saviour in John x. 8.\* They looked upon them as teachers who were sent, not to guide souls partaking of a Godlike essence to the consciousness and free development of their higher nature, to the knowledge of the supreme God; but rather to lead them away from him to the worship of the Demiurge. That they denied, however, the existence of any connection whatsoever between the Old and the New Testament, seems hardly reconcilable with the manner in which, according to Photius, they explained the words in John i. 11. According to him, by the *idioiç* (his own), they understood the *λόγουç προφητικούç* (prophetic oracles). If these words were really so interpreted by them, we can only reconcile the two assertions by supposing that they looked upon the prophets as men who, in their own intention, were solely bent on advancing the kingdom of the Demiurge, but who, unconsciously, and in spite of themselves, were made subservient to the purposes of the supreme God, and instruments to prepare the way for *him*, who was to deliver mankind from the Demiurge's kingdom. But as Photius does not quote the words of the Paulicians (perhaps of Sergius), in the precise form in which they were expressed, and as it is possible he may have misunderstood them, we might be led to suspect that the latter was really the case here. There is, however, another way of understanding these words of Sergius, which, to say the least, is far more congruous with the Paulician system, and which accords also with their mode of interpreting John i. 9. Regarding, as they did, the earthly world as a work of the Demiurge, altogether foreign from the province of the supreme God, but recognising the souls of men as allied to God, destined for, and capable of, receiving the revelation of the divine Logos, they would be led, in the most natural manner, to understand by *idioiç* men as such—creatures bearing within them a slumbering consciousness of God.

Certain it is, according to what we have already remarked on a former page, that they gave especial weight to the authority of the apostle Paul; and his epistles must have been

\* See Phot. 1 p. 24. Petr. Sic. p. 18.

HIGH AUTHORITY OF ST. PAUL.

considered by them as the main sources of the knowledge of Christian doctrines. From a marginal gloss in Peter the Sicilian, p. 18, we find, at least in reference to the later Paulicians, that they, like Marcion, possessed also an epistle of Paul to the Laodiceans, whether this was the same as the epistle of Paul to the Ephesians, under another name, or an apocryphal epistle. They also regarded with peculiar reverence the very words of Christ recorded by the Evangelists. Hence, they did not scruple to imitate the Catholic Christians, in testifying their respect for the book of the gospels, by the ceremony of prostration, *προσκύνησις*; they fell down before it, and kissed it; but to show that this act of veneration had no reference to the sign of the cross, usually marked on the books of the gospels, but that it was paid only to the book itself, they said, in so far as it contains the words of our Lord.\* According to Photius and to Peter the Sicilian,† it would seem that they received all the four gospels alike, as sources of the knowledge of the words of Christ; but a marginal remark to Peter the Sicilian affirms of the later Paulicians‡ that they used only two gospels. This latter account is to be preferred as more accurately defining the fact: nor is it difficult to explain how the other less exact account may have arisen. The Paulicians, when the words of Christ were quoted to them from any one of the gospels, were accustomed to acknowledge the authority of these declarations; indeed, they were found to cite such declarations themselves in their disputes with others. Hence it was inferred that they attributed equal authority to all the four gospels. But it was quite consistent with this practice, that they should recognize only two of the gospels as absolutely trustworthy and uncorrupted fountains of religious knowledge, although they borrowed or received as valid from the other gospels § whatever seemed to them to bear the impress of primitive Christianity. Those two gospels were first, that of Luke—as in the case of Marcion,

\* Φασὶ δὲ τὸ βιβλίον προσκυνεῖν ὡς τὸν διαπονικὸν προίκον λόγον.  
Phot. I. p. 33.

† See the same, p. 18.

‡ Οἱ γὰρ τὸν μόνον τοῦ δύο χεώντας εἰσαγγελίους.

§ But they could take greater liberties in getting round these latter. Hence the charge brought against Sergius, that he had falsified especially the Gospel of Matthew. See the Anathema II. against Tychicus, in Tollius, p. 114.

and for the same reason, on account of the reference to Paul,—and, secondly, the gospel of John, as is evident from the words of Christ, which they cite. This latter gospel would possess peculiar attractions for them, on account of its own distinctive character. What we have said with regard to their use of the other two gospels must be applied also, if we follow out the hint given by the marginal note above quoted, to their mode of using the other writings of the New Testament, excepting the epistles of St. Paul. But they wholly rejected the epistles of St. Peter, since they did not acknowledge him to be a genuine apostle, but counted him as one of the thieves and robbers who corrupted the divine doctrines. Photius alleges† as the reason, Peter's denial of his master. We certainly believe that Photius did not draw here simply upon his own imagination, but that the Paulicians did really appeal, in their disputes, to Peter's denial of Christ, as one evidence of his unapostolical character, and of his untrustworthiness; for, as we have before remarked, even the Paulicians acknowledged that there was one way of denying the faith which involved a heavy crime; viz., when it was done from cowardice, which they certainly distinguished from a justifiable accommodation (*oikouropic*).‡ But this, surely, was not the special reason, on account of which they refused to recognize Peter as a genuine apostle; they were, doubtless, led to do this for the same reasons which induced Marcion also to reject the apostolic authority of St. Peter. They regarded him as a *judaizing* apostle, as an opponent of St. Paul, as one who was seeking to confound Christianity again with Judaism, which appeared evident from the incident mentioned in Galat. ii. But to represent Peter, who was so odious to them, as a man liable to be suspected from the first, they appealed, in their disputes, to his momentary denial of our Lord. "How can we," said they, "have any confidence in a man whom we find so cowardly and fickle-minded as Peter afterwards showed himself to be, when he preached Judaism instead of Christianity?"§

\* In the marginal remark above referred to, καὶ μᾶλλον (χρῶνται) τῷ κατὰ οὐκάν.

† L. 24.

† Here we differ from Gieseler, who supposes that Photius incorrectly referred to the denial of Christ's person, what the Paulicians affirmed respecting the denial of the gospel truth by Peter, at Antioch.

§ The further history of the Paulicians we reserve till the next following period.

This sect, however, was but one form of the manifestation of a more deeply-seated antagonism ;\* that is to say, we perceive in it the reaction and counteraction—though modified, in this case, by the fusion with Gnosticism, and veiled under the Gnostic forms—the reaction and counteraction of the Christian consciousness, in its efforts to acquire freedom, against that confusion of Jewish and Christian elements which appeared in the later church ; and we have here revealed to us the incipient stages of a remarkable reaction which, as it began to spread more widely in the succeeding centuries, unfolded itself in a continually widening circle, and in an ever-increasing multiplicity of details, in opposition to the perfected system of the ecclesiastical hierarchy.

\* Although the Paulicians, among the oriental sects opposed to the hierarchy, were the ones who made the greatest sensation, yet we are not to suppose they were the only sect of this kind in this period. There were, doubtless, other sects also deriving their origin from the Manichaean and Gnostics, whose offshoots will become better known to us in the following periods—sects which have not been sufficiently distinguished from the Paulicians in this period. Thus, among the Byzantine historians, we find associated with the Paulicians a certain sect of *Ἄσιγγενοι*—probably a sect who were accused of following certain Gnostic or Manichaean principles because they held that the touch of many things was defiling: *μὴ Σίγης*, Colos. ii. 21.

## FOURTH PERIOD.

FROM THE DEATH OF THE EMPEROR CHARLEMAGNE TO  
POPE GREGORY SEVENTH. FROM A.D. 814 TO A.D. 1073.

### SECTION FIRST.

#### EXTENSION AND LIMITATION OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

As we have already remarked, in the history of the preceding period, it was the intention of the emperor Charles that the circle of churches and of missionary establishments, about to be founded in Northern Germany, should extend beyond these limits into the countries occupied by Scandinavian and Slavonian tribes; and, in order to this, he had resolved to fix a metropolis for these northern missions in North Albingia. For this reason he had refused to incorporate a church planted on the borders of the empire, near Hamburg, and placed under the care of Heridac, a priest, with any of the neighbouring bishoprics, meaning to reserve in his own hands the power of establishing there, for the purposes above mentioned, an independent bishopric.\* But the war in which he was then engaged with the Danes, and afterwards his death, prevented the accomplishment of these plans by himself; and they were first carried fully into effect, under peculiarly favourable circumstances, by his son and successor, Lewis the Pious. In Denmark certain feuds had arisen, touching the right of succession to the crown; and, on this occasion, his interference was solicited by one of the *præcet*, Harald Crag, who ruled in Jutland. In answer to this application he sent, in 822, an ambassador to Denmark;

\* Rimbert's Life of Anschar, c. 12. Pertz, *Monumenta Germaniae historica*, T. II. p. 698.

and, with the negotiations which ensued, was introduced a proposition for the establishment, or at least to prepare the way for the establishment, of a mission among the Danes. The primate of France, Ebbo, archbishop of Rheims, a man educated at the imperial court, and for a time the emperor's favourite minister, was selected by him for the management of this business. Ebbo, who at the court of his sovereign had often seen ambassadors from the pagan Danes, had for a long time before felt desirous of consecrating himself to the work of converting that people.\* Practised in the affairs of the world, and ardently devoted to the spread of Christianity, as well as confident of its triumphant progress, he was peculiarly qualified to unite the office of ambassador with that of a teacher among the heathen. Hatligar, bishop of Cambra, author of the *Liber penitentialis*,† was for a while associated with him: and the emperor made him the grant of a place called Welanao or Welna, probably the present Munsterdorf, near Itzehoe,‡ as a secure retreat, as well as a means of support during his labours in the north. He succeeded in gaining over king Harald himself, and those immediately about his person, to Christianity; though political reasons may, no doubt, have contributed somewhat to this success. In the year 826 the king, with his wife and a numerous following, made a visit to the emperor at Ingelheim, where the rite of baptism was with great solemnity administered to the king, and the empress Judith godmother to several others. The emperor himself and the empress Judith, who submitted to baptism were magnificently loaded with presents. This would naturally appeal to many who were not to be influenced by purely religious motives. As king Harald was now about to return to his country, though far from being as yet fully established in the Christian faith; as he was likely to be assailed in the midst of heathenism by so many temptations; and as, moreover, the time of archbishop Ebbo was too much occupied with the spiritual and secular concerns of his station, to enable him

\* See Rimbert's Life of Anschar, c. 13. *Afflatus Spiritu pro vocazione gentium et maxime Danorum, quos in palatio saepius viderat.*

† See Vol. III. p. 291.

‡ See Langebeth's note on the Life of Anschar, in *Scriptoribus rerum Danicarum, Hafniæ, 1772.* T. I. p. 453.

to bestow the requisite attention on the affairs of the mission, it was thought necessary to look out among the monks for some person suitably qualified to accompany the king in the capacity of a priest and teacher.

This duty was allotted to a young man already far advanced in the Christian life, who, by faithfulness in the least, had proved himself worthy of being placed over affairs of greater moment—the monk Anschar or Ansgar, born not far from Corbie in France, in the diocese of Amiens, A.D. 801. In accordance with his natural disposition, which inclined him from childhood to retire apart for serious meditation and prayer, he was early given by his parents to the monastery of Corbie, which had attained a high reputation under the government of the abbot Adalhard, and where Paschasius Radbert, one of the learned men of his age, directed the studies of a flourishing school. Anschar, his most industrious pupil, afterwards became the assistant of his labours; where he remained until called to a more independent sphere of action. The occasion was as follows:—Among the Saxons, now finally subdued after so many obstinate battles, the emperor Charles had already determined to found, along with other ecclesiastical establishments, monasteries, for the tillage of the land, and for the Christian education of the people, purposes for which these establishments had been found so well adapted in other parts of Germany. But the execution of this design met with too many obstacles in a country as yet hardly rescued from paganism. He confined his endeavours, therefore, in the first place, simply to preparing the way for the accomplishment of this object, by distributing the Saxons, whom in time of war he had taken as captives or as hostages, among the Frankish monasteries; so that, after having been trained there as monks, they might return and labour for the transplantation of monachism into their own country. The high reputation of the monastery at Corbie induced him to place an unusual number of the young Saxons under the care of that institution. The abbot Adalhard, who well understood the designs of his kinsman the emperor, was informed by one of these young Saxons, named Theodrad, of a tract of ground on his father's estate abounding in springs of water, and well-adapted for the foundation of a monastery. This Saxon youth he sent home to his country for the purpose of procuring from his friends

#### A MONASTERY IN SAXONY.

a gift of the spot described, in order that a monastery might be founded there ; in which business he would be very likely to succeed. But Adalhard was soon afterwards prevented, by the pressure of political business\* committed to his care, then by the disgrace into which he fell with the emperor Lewis the Pious, involving the loss of his abbacy, from prosecuting this plan. But another Adalhard, who succeeded him as abbot of Corbie, followed up the enterprise, and at the diet of Paderborn, in the year 815, obtained permission from the emperor to found a monastery in the spot above designated. Monks were sent there from the monastery of Corbie, and by them monasticism was first introduced into that region. The monastery soon acquired great fame among the people ; many young men of noble parentage applied for admission into it, and many boys were placed there to be educated. But the country in which it was placed was too unfruitful to secure for it a sufficient support ; the monks were obliged to struggle with the severest want, and indeed would have been wholly unable to sustain themselves, had they not been provided with food and clothing by the parent monastery of Corbie. After having thus maintained their post with difficulty for more than six years, they were delivered from a situation of the most extreme distress by the abbot Adalhard, who, recalled from his exile, and restored to his former situation, had acquired still greater influence than ever. He not only procured for them momentary relief, by sending them waggons loaded with provisions, but also secured to them a more lasting benefit by persuading the emperor to bestow on him, as a gift for this purpose, a more productive region of country in his own domains, not far from Hoxter, on the Weser ; and to this place the monastery was removed in 822, where, from its parent seat, it received the name of Corvey.† Anschar was one of the monks transferred from Corbie to this spot. He had the direction of the conventional school, and at the same time preached to the people, which doubtless served to prepare him for his later labours among the heathen.‡

\* The administration of the empire of Italy during the minority of the prince Pipin.

† See the account by an ancient author in Mabillon, *acta sanctorum*. O. B. T. IV. P. I., and Pertz, *monumenta*, II. p. 576.

‡ See Rimbert's account of his life, s. 6.

From early childhood Anschar was conscious of an attraction towards the godlike, which kept him from wasting his powers on frivolous pursuits. Voices of admonition and warning had come, or seemed to come, to him in visions and dreams. The glory of God, the blessedness of the life eternal, had been presented to him in bright and inspiring images. Once, for example, he thought himself lifted up to the Source of light, whence all holy beings drew their supplies; and he gave the following account of what he witnessed: "All the ranks of the heavenly host, standing round in exultation, drew joy from this fountain. The light was immeasurable, so that I could trace neither beginning nor end to it. And although I could see far and near, yet I could not discern what was embraced within that immeasurable light. I saw nothing but its outward shining, yet I believed that He was there, of whom St. Peter says that even the angels desire to behold Him. He himself was, in a certain sense, in all, and all around him were in Him. He encompassed them from without, and supplying their every want, inspired and guided them from within. In every direction alike He was all. There was neither sun nor moon to give light there, nor any appearance of heaven or earth; but the brightness of the transparent ether was such, that instead of being the least oppressive, it refreshed the eye, satisfying the souls of all with inexpressible bliss. And from the midst of that immeasurable light a heavenly voice addressed me, saying, 'Go, and return to me again crowned with martyrdom.' In the vision which beamed forth from the depth of his own consciousness in this symbolical representation, we see disclosed the inmost longings of his soul. We may presume that the accounts he had heard of the labours of missionaries among the German tribes had awakened in him an irrepressible desire of preaching the gospel among the heathen, with a willingness even to sacrifice his life in his Master's cause. Two years afterwards he had another vision, while deeply engaged in prayer. He thought that Christ appeared to him, calling upon him to confess his sins, that he might receive absolution. He said, "Thou knowest all things; not a thought is hidden from thee." But the Lord replied, "It is true that I know all things; yet it is my will that men should confess to me their sins, that they may be forgiven." So after he had confessed his sins Christ pronounced them forgiven—

a word that filled him with inexpressible joy. At another time, when assured after the same manner that his sins were forgiven, he inquired, "Lord, what wouldst thou have me to do?" when he was told, "Go, preach the word of God to the tribes of the heathen."\*

Thus, by the history of his own Christian experience, and by the leadings of the divine Spirit which guided it, Anschar was already fitted, and waiting for this great calling, when summoned to undertake it. The abbot Wala of Corvey, on being consulted by the emperor Lewis, knew of no other person whom he could confidently recommend as qualified for the Danish mission. And when the emperor asked Anschar himself whether he was willing, for God's glory, to accompany king Harald to Denmark, he replied at once that he was both willing and anxious to go. His abbot Wala then declared that he would by no means compel him, by his monastic vow of obedience, to undertake so formidable a work; but if he chose this vocation of his own free will, the abbot said, he rejoiced at it, and cheerfully gave him permission to engage in it. Though many tried to intimidate and dishearten him, by dwelling on the hardships and dangers he must necessarily encounter, he adhered steadfastly to his purpose, and, retiring to a neighbouring vineyard, prepared himself in solitude, by prayer and study of the Scriptures, for the great undertaking. Only one monk, Aubert, a man of noble descent, volunteered to accompany him; but they found it would be necessary to wait upon themselves, for not a single domestic of the monastery was disposed voluntarily to offer his services, and the abbot refused, in this case, to interpose his authority.

The emperor called the two missionaries before him. He gave them church vessels, tents, and whatever else they needed for their journey, and dismissed them with exhortations to zeal and perseverance in their calling. At first they met with no very favourable reception from king Harald and his attendants; the latter being still too deeply sunk in pagan barbarism to pay any due respect to the office of a missionary. But on their arrival at Cologne, whence they were to pass by the Rhine to Holland, and then to Denmark by the way of Dorestatum (Wyk te Duerstade), at that time a famous commercial

\* Vita Anschar, s. 9.

town, the central dépôt of the trade with the north, and of the commercial intercourse between pagan and Christian tribes, bishop Hadelbod presented them with a convenient vessel for their voyage, which induced king Harald to join company with them, thus affording them an opportunity of winning his confidence and regard, a task in which the engaging manners of Anschar eminently qualified him to succeed.

The first two years, from the end of 826, Anschar spent in Denmark, where he is said to have converted many. The accounts, however, are too vague and indefinite to be entitled to much confidence. His most important proceeding which marked the wisdom of his course, was to purchase boys belonging to the nation, whom, with others presented to him by the king, he took under his own care to educate and train as teachers for their countrymen. The work commenced from small beginnings. A school for twelve boys was the first Christian institution planted by Anschar, which, for the sake of security, he established on the boundaries at Hadeby, or Schleswig. The unsettled condition of the country prevented him from doing more. By embracing Christianity, and forming connections with the Franks, Harald had rendered himself unpopular with his nation. In the year 828 he was expelled by his enemies, and driven to seek refuge in a Frankish foef, which he had received as a present from the emperor. Nor was there any longer safety for Anschar in Denmark. Besides, he had lost his sole companion Aubert, whom sickness had compelled to return to Corvey, where he soon afterwards died. While the circle of Anschar's labours was becoming thus circumscribed, a new and larger field was opened to him, which he joyfully accepted. By intercourse with Christian nations some seeds of Christianity had already been scattered in Sweden. Commerce especially had contributed to this event. Christian merchants had conveyed the knowledge of Christianity to Sweden, and merchants from Sweden becoming acquainted with Christianity at Dorstede had, many of them, no doubt there embraced the faith. Others, induced by what they had heard about Christianity, betook themselves to Dorstede for the purpose of obtaining a better knowledge of the religion, or of receiving baptism.\* In the expeditions, moreover, which they

\* See the passage from Anschar's life, s. 27, cited in full on a future page.

#### ANSCHAR IN SWEDEN.

made to distant Christian lands, they had brought away with them numbers of Christian captives ; by which means the knowledge of Christianity had already found its way to Sweden, and attracted, more or less, the attention of the people. Hence it came about that certain envoys from Sweden sent to the emperor Lewis on other business, informed him that there were many among their people desirous of obtaining a better knowledge of Christianity, and of becoming incorporated with the Christian church ; and the emperor was invited to send them priests. Accordingly, the emperor replied to Anschar, proposing that he should undertake the mission to Sweden, with a view to ascertain whether any opening presented itself for the preaching of the gospel in that country. Anschar declared at once that he was ready to engage in any enterprise which might serve to glorify the name of Christ.

The Danish mission having been confided to the care of the monk Gislema, Anschar, accompanied by monk Witmar of Corvey, embarked on board a trading vessel for Sweden, in the year 829, taking with him various presents from the emperor to the king of Sweden, the object of which was to procure a readier acceptance for the proposals of the missionary. Attacked, however, on the voyage by pirates, they were glad to escape with their lives, after having lost nearly everything they carried with them. Many of the crew were now for abandoning the voyage ; but Anschar would not allow himself to be discouraged. He declared it to be his settled resolution not to return till he had ascertained whether God was preparing the way for the preaching of the gospel in Sweden. They landed at Birká (Biorka), on the lake of Mälarn, a port near the ancient capital Sigtuna. Anschar obtained permission of the monarch to preach the gospel, and to baptize all such as were willing to embrace Christianity. They found also many Christian captives who rejoiced in being allowed once, more to partake of the communion. Among the first who came over to Christianity was Herigar (Heggeir), a man of rank, and the governor of a department. He became a zealous promoter of Christianity, and erected a church on his own freehold estate.

Having thus, after residing in the country a year and a half, prepared the way for the spread of the gospel, and accurately informed himself with regard to its future prospects, he re-

turned, in 831, to the Frankish kingdom. The favourable prospects for the extension of Christianity in the North, disclosed by Anschar's report, induced the emperor Lewis to carry out the plan already projected by his father Charlemagne. He founded at Hamburgh a metropolis, which was to serve as a centre of operation for the missions of the North, and got Anschar consecrated archbishop of North Albingia. The diocese being a poor one, and constantly exposed to the inroads of the pagan tribes of the North, he bestowed on him the monastery Turholt (Thoroult) in Flanders, between Bruges and Ypres, both as a place of refuge and as a source of revenue to defray the expenses of his station. To place this arrangement on a more stable foundation, he immediately despatched Anschar to Rome, on a visit to Pope Gregory IV. The latter confirmed all that had been done; bestowed on Anschar the pall, or distinguishing badge of the archiepiscopal dignity, and conferred on him, in connection with archbishop Ebbo, the charge of preaching the gospel to the nations of the North. But as Anschar was unable, alone, to supply the wants of both the missions, that in Denmark and that in Sweden, and as Ebbo, though he never ceased to take a lively interest in the spread of Christianity in those regions, was still prevented by the multiplicity of his other engagements from lending an active personal co-operation in the work, the latter appointed and consecrated to the episcopal office, as his representative, his nephew Gauzbert; and to him was especially entrusted the mission in Sweden. At his ordination he received the name of Simon. The monastery founded by the archbishop at Welna was bestowed on Gauzbert, for the same purpose as Thoroult had been granted to Anschar.

As to Denmark, the mission after the expulsion of king Harald, had been shut out, it is true from all immediate access to this country, where king Horick, a violent enemy of Christianity, reigned supreme. Anschar, however, was unwearied in making efforts on a small scale, hoping by these lighter beginnings to prepare the way for more important operations in the future. He purchased captives of the Danish, Norman, and Slavonian races, particularly boys; and such as he found suitable for his purpose, he either retained near his own person, to be trained as monks and

clergymen, the future teachers of their countrymen, or sent them to be educated in the monastery of Thoroult. In Sweden, on the other hand, the state of things was more favourable, so far as this, that Christianity here had at the outset gained followers among the people themselves, who declared in its favour, not from outward motives of interest or advantage, but from the impulse of their inward feelings. Gauzbert met in Sweden with a favourable reception, and continued to labour there for many years with good success; but in the year 845 he was attacked in his own house, robbed of all he had, and driven away by an insurrectionary mob of the maddened heathen populace. About the same time that the Swedish mission was thus interrupted, Anschar's work in the North was also threatened with destruction. In 845, the city of Hamburgh was attacked and pillaged by the Normans, who laid waste the whole country with fire and sword, making the churches and the clergy the special objects of their fury, and Anschar lost his all. It was with extreme difficulty that he managed to save himself and his relics. A magnificent church, which he had procured to be erected, with the monastery attached to it, as well as the library presented to him by the emperor, fell a prey to the flames. When Anschar beheld the fruits of his frugality and toil for so many years annihilated as in a moment, he repeated once and again the words of Job, "The Lord gave, the Lord has taken away,—he has done what seemed him good,—blessed be the name of the Lord." Followed by his companions and scholars he was compelled to wander about in uncertainty, till at length he found refuge on the estates of a noble lady, by the name of Icia or Ida, at Rameshoe in the department of Holstein. From this spot, he now travelled over his pillaged and wasted diocese, labouring to promote the religious instruction, to confirm the faith, and to console the minds, of its unfortunate inhabitants. Meantime, he had lost also his powerful protector, the emperor Lewis, who died in 840. In consequence of the division of the territory after his death, he was deprived of the monastery Thoroult, which had hitherto supported him in his poverty. Many of his companions forsook him for want of the means of sustenance; many returned back to the monastery of Corbie. But Anschar made the best of his situation, and endeavoured faithfully to fulfil the duties

of his calling in the midst of so many embarrassing circumstances.\*

Thus he laboured many years, travelling from his place of refuge through every part of his wasted diocese. In the meanwhile, he beheld the mission destroyed which had been commenced in Sweden, without any apparent prospects of its restoration. The archbishop Ebbo of Rheims, from whom that mission originally proceeded, having become entangled in the political quarrels of the Frankish empire, was for a time, it is true, wholly withdrawn from missionary affairs; but when, after many calamities, in which he had involved himself by participating in the insurrection against the emperor Lewis the Pious, he became bishop of Hildesheim, his zeal in behalf of the holy enterprise was rekindled, and he exhorted Anschar not to be disheartened by these accumulating embarrassments. In their last interview on this subject, said he to the latter—“Be assured, that what we have laboured to accomplish for the glory of Christ, will bring forth fruit in the Lord; for it is my firm and settled belief, yea I know assuredly, that although what we have undertaken to do among those nations, meets for a time with obstacles and hindrances on account of our sins, yet it will not be lost, but thrive more and more, till the name of the Lord extends to the extreme boundaries of the earth!”

Meanwhile, the way was preparing for an improvement of his affairs. At the very time Anschar met with the calamity above described, Leuderich, bishop of Bremen, died, and the vacancy of this bishopric setting Lewis of Germany to devising measures for extricating an archbishop, who laboured so zealously for the good of the church of the North, from all his difficulties. He probably left this bishopric for a time without an incumbent, with the intention of uniting it to the archbishopric of Hamburg, and thus relieving the poverty of this latter, which was constantly exposed to be devastated by barbarians—an arrangement, however, which could be carried into complete effect only by the removal of various difficulties and objections, on the part of the spiritual and secular orders,

\* This scholar Rimbert says: *ipse cum paucis, qui cum eo substituerant, prout poterat, so agebat et hoc in paupertate degens, injunctum sibi officium nequam non deserere voluit.* Vit. s. 21.

arising from the necessity of introducing various changes in the relations of the existing dioceses to each other,—the bishopric of Bremen having, in fact, been subordinate to another archbishopric, then belonging to the kingdom of Lotharingia, the archbishopric of Cologne. For this reason, and because he was unwilling to create any strife in the church, and wished to avoid all appearance of self-interest, Anschar declined, for a long time, to accept of the assistance which was thus proffered to him.\* By various negotiations, extending from the year 847 to the year 849, all the difficulties which impeded this new arrangement were finally removed; moreover, the change was sanctioned by the papal confirmation. Thus Anschar came into possession of a larger and surer income, without which he would have found it impossible to maintain the missionary establishments in the North, with any prospects of success. From henceforth the town of Bremen, on account of its safer position, became the ordinary seat of the archbishop.

Under these more favourable circumstances, Anschar turned his attention once more to the missions in Denmark and Sweden. By presents, he succeeded in softening the temper of Horick (Erich) king of Jutland, hitherto a violent enemy of Christianity. He undertook the management of certain political negotiations with that monarch, in conducting which he won his confidence to such a degree, that the king admitted him to his private councils, and refused to treat with any other agent in his affairs with the German empire. He availed himself of this personal attachment of the king, to obtain his consent for the admission of Christianity into his kingdom. We have no evidence, it is true, that the king himself embraced the Christian faith, but he held it in great respect; and Anschar was permitted to lay the foundation of a Christian church, and to establish the Christian worship of God wherever he chose, as well as to instruct and baptize all who desired it. He selected, as the most eligible spot for founding a church, the town of Schleswig, situated on the borders of the two kingdoms, a place which had much intercourse by trade with

\* Vita Anschar, c. 22. Pertz monumenta, T. II. p. 706. Dominus et pastor noster hoc sibi periculorum esse aliquo modo formidans et ne a quibuslibet nævo cupiditatis reprehenderetur, caute prævidens, non facile huic dispositioni assentiebat.

the Christian towns, Dorstede and Hamburgh.\* Over the church here established he appointed a priest; many concealed Christians, who had been baptized at Hamburgh or Dorstede, now ventured to make public profession of their religion, and rejoiced in the opportunity of once more uniting in the Christian worship of God. As from this time the Christian merchants of Dorstede came to the place with greater confidence, and the intercourse between the two marts grew more lively, the event operated favourably for the prosperity of the town, and Christianity recommended itself by its beneficial influence on the condition of the burgesses. Many received baptism, but many also joined in the public worship only as catechumens, for the same reason that had induced multitudes already in more ancient times to put off their baptism,† under the impression that, by delaying that rite until the last moment, they should, by then receiving it, pass without blemish to immortal life. Many who, under the visitations of sickness, had sought help in vain from the gods, on whom they had lavished their offerings, submitted to baptism, and their recovery was regarded as an effect of the holy rite.‡

As to the Swedish mission, its failure happened precisely at the same point of time which had proved so unfortunate to Anschar; and during the seven ensuing years, after the expulsion of Gauzbert from Sweden, he was unable to do anything towards the re-establishment of the mission. At length, in the year 801, he succeeded in again finding a suitable person to engage in this enterprise. He prevailed on Ardgard, a priest and eremite, to exchange a life of peaceful seclusion, consecrated solely to his own improvement, for more active labours in promoting the kingdom of God. He calculated in this case especially, on the well-known zeal of his ancient friend Herigar, to whom, above all others, it was his earnest advice that Ardgard should attach himself. Nor was he deceived in his expectations. Through every change of circumstances Herigar had not only continued steadfast in the faith himself, having never been moved by any pressure of distress to seek help from the gods, but had boldly proclaimed his faith among the heathens, and many circumstances, in themselves unimportant, had contributed to give his testimonies

\* Sleswig, the place on the Sles, Heithaby.

† See Vol. I. p. 321.

‡ See Vita, c. 24.

and exhortations additional weight with the people. For it happened here, as it often has in the history of missions, the slightest circumstances became influential, from the connection in which they were placed by an overruling Providence.

One of the persons who had taken an active part in the tumultuary proceedings by which Gauzbert was forced to leave Sweden, was the son of a chieftain, and he had conveyed a large portion of the booty which fell to his share to his father's house. It so happened that this family were afterwards visited with sore calamities ; they lost the greater part of their property, and the son, with many other members of the family, died. The father, judging after the usual manner of a heathen, concluded that he had incurred the displeasure of some deity, and thus brought upon himself these misfortunes. Following the common practice in such cases, he went to a priest, for the purpose of consulting him respecting the God whom he had provoked to bring these evils upon him, and whose favour he must seek to propitiate, in order to be delivered from them. The priest assured him, that inasmuch as he had been so faithful a worshipper of all the gods, there was no other whom he could have injured but the God of the Christians ; and he therefore advised him to remove as quickly as possible from his house every article which had been consecrated to that deity. A religious volume, belonging to the spoils obtained by his son in the attack on Gauzbert, was immediately removed from the house, and bound to a stake. The man vowed satisfaction to the God whom he had injured. The volume was afterwards taken away by a Christian, and preserved till the arrival of Ardgari. It was this Christian who related the whole transaction to Rimbart, Anschar's disciple and biographer.\* Again ; it was a prevailing custom among

\* See Anschar's Life, c. 18. This Christian afterwards, in the monastery of Corvey, committed the Psalms to memory, with a view to supply to himself, in this way, the want of a knowledge of letters. *Ex cuius ore etiam ista cognovimus, qui postea magna fidei et devotionis extitit, ita ut psalmos quoque apud nos memoriter sine litteris didicerit.* He must, therefore, have either learnt Latin without a knowledge of the Latin alphabet, which, however, is not probable, or there must have been, even at that early period, a Swedish version of the Psalms ; or, it is possible, that he may have used the version of Uphilas, which was then still to be met with, as we learn from Walafrid Strabo, in this century, who says of the same (*de rebus eccles. c. VII.*), *quorum adhuc monu-*

the Swedes, when exposed to the calamities of war, or to other dangers, to seek the especial assistance of some one of their gods, vowing to him a gift in case of deliverance;\* and if they were delivered, then this god was made an object of special veneration. It so happened that Birk, a place already mentioned, the residence of many wealthy merchants, was threatened by a hostile army; and the inhabitants had sought protection in vain from their gods. Herigar seized hold of this occasion to direct them to the Almighty God, whom he himself worshipped. The imminent danger procured him a hearing; and, in accordance with the usual custom in such cases, the whole population met together in a field, where they vowed to the Lord Christ a fast, and a distribution of alms in his name, in case he should deliver them from the power of the enemy.† By a concurrence of circumstances, they were actually delivered. And although this and similar experiences could not convert them, it is true, at once into believing Christians, yet they were at least led more and more to the conviction, that Christ too was a powerful deity,—mightier than other gods. Herigar made the best use of such incidents, to prove the power of the God whom he worshipped.

We may conceive, then, with what delight the arrival of Ardgard was hailed by the stadholder, who, for seven years, had not received the holy supper from the hands of a priest. Through his mediation, he obtained permission to preach wherever he pleased. There were many Christians besides, who had painfully felt the want of a Christian priest, and were not a little rejoiced at beholding one once more among them. One of these was Frideburg, a pious widow, who, in spite of all the violence of the pagans around her, had remained steadfast in the faith. And seeing no prospect that, in the hour of death, which to a person of her years could not be far distant, she could receive the holy supper from the hands of a priest, she had purchased some wine, and carefully preserved it in a vessel, directing her daughter to administer to her, at

menta apud nonnullos habentur. Comp. Massmann's excellent edition of the Commentary on John, in the Gothic language. München, 1834, p. 68.

\* Adam. Bremens. hist. eccles. c. 230. Si quando proliantes in angusto positi sunt, ex multitudine Deorum, quos colunt, unum in auxilium invocant, ei post victoriam deinceps sunt devoti illumque cæteris anteponunt.

† Rimbert, c. 19. Exeuntes, acut sibi consuetudinis erat, in campum pro liberatione sui iunium et elemosynas domino Christo devoverunt.

## FRIDEBURG DISTRIBUTES HER GOODS TO THE POOR.

the last hour, a portion of the element, which was to represent to her the blood of the Lord, and be the sign that she commended herself to the Lord's mercy, in passing from the world. The greater was her satisfaction in being able to join in the Christian worship of God, restored by Ardgar; and she now had her most earnest wish fulfilled, in being permitted in her last moments to draw comfort and strength from partaking of the holy supper. Zealously devoted in her lifetime to works of charity, she charged her daughter Kathle to dispose of all her effects after her death, and to distribute the avails in alms—a bequest not unmixed, perhaps, with some superstitious notion of the effect of the pious act, in delivering her departed soul from the pains of purgatory. As the poor were few in numbers, however, in that neighbourhood, —the inequality of conditions being less strongly marked in the simple mode of life which there prevailed—the daughter was to go with the money to Dorstede,\* where churches and priests, and also paupers, abounded.† These directions the daughter faithfully obeyed. Proceeding to Dorstede, she procured the assistance of pious women devoted to that business, to go round with her to all the churches, where the poor were to be found, and inform her how to distribute the money according to the various necessities and deserts of the needy.† Herigar also enjoyed the privilege of receiving the

\* One evidence of the important influence which the constant intercourse between this commercial town and the northern kingdoms had on the spread of Christianity.

† The great number of churches attracted thither also a multitude of the poor; and the unwise distribution of alms, no doubt, encouraged and promoted poverty.

‡ It is further recorded, that when the daughter, with her companions and assistants, had distributed about half the sum, she ventured to take one piece of the money to purchase refreshments for herself and her friends, weary and exhausted with their labours. But great was her astonishment on finding in the purse, which she had placed empty in a particular spot, the whole sum distributed, with the exception of that single piece. She consulted with a priest, in whom she confided, about this wonderful event; and he assured her that God intended, by this miracle, to let her see that he, the almighty and all-sufficient in himself, needed no gifts; and that whatever was given to the poor, from love to him, should be richly repaid in heaven, to encourage her in similar works of charity, and moreover to assure her that her mother was happy with the Lord. This money, he said, was now presented to her by the Lord, and she might dispose of it as she pleased. See *Vi'a Anschar*, c.

holy supper in his last moments; but upon his death, the eremite missionary could no longer resist the too strong bent of his mind for the quiet of the contemplative life, and, in 852, returned to his former seclusion.

After his return, Anschar was the less disposed to think this mission ought to be left unprovided for, as his friendly understanding with king Horik, who promised to lend his aid and protection to the cause, seemed to open for it more favourable prospects than ever. He invited his fellow labourer, the bishop Gauzbert, to resume the work in which he had been interrupted; but Gauzbert represented to him, that as he himself had left behind him so unfavourable an impression on the minds of the people, it was not he, but Anschar, of whom they still retained the more friendly recollections, who was the most suitable person to undertake this mission. Anschar was compelled to admit the correctness of this statement, and joyfully obeyed a call, which, no less by its relation to the proposed aim of his life, and to the leadings of divine Providence indicated by his position, than by one of those visions which imaged forth the divine aspirations of his soul, seemed to him to be from God. During the time of his deepest anxiety about the Swedish mission, he had a dream. Adalhard, abbot of Corbie, appeared before him in a glorified form, and foretold him, that from his lips the islands and the distant tribes should hear the word of God: that he was destined to carry salvation to the extreme boundaries of the earth; and that the Lord would glorify his servant. This dream appeared to him as a prediction of the spread of Christianity in Sweden; and the words, "the Lord would glorify his servant," he was inclined to interpret as having reference to his destined martyrdom, which he had anticipated from his early youth.\*

The more gladly, therefore, did Anschar follow the suggestion of his friend Gauzbert; and with a cheerful alacrity he was ready even to meet the crown of martyrdom, which according to the vision might also await him in Sweden; though he by no means intended to seek the martyr's death, by rashly disregarding any rule of prudence in the conduct of the

20. We have here either a beautiful myth, or an example of that deception sometimes resorted to for the purpose of working on the faith of the new converts.

\* See l. c. s. 25.

mission. He commenced his journey in 853, as an ambassador of king Lewis, entrusted with special business from that monarch to Sweden, and accompanied by the priest Erimbert, a nephew of Gauzbert, appointed by the latter as his representative. King Horik sent with him an envoy to introduce and recommend him to the Swedish king Olof.\* By his envoy, the king declared himself in a way which clearly illustrates the point of view in which he regarded Anschar, as well as the faith he preached. The king said, "He was well acquainted with this servant of God, who came to him as an ambassador from the emperor Lewis. Never in all his life had he seen so good a man, nor found one so worthy of confidence. Having found him out to be a man of such distinguished goodness, he had let him order everything as he chose to do in regard to Christianity. Accordingly, he begged king Olof to allow him in like manner to arrange everything as he pleased for the introduction of Christianity into his own kingdom, for he would wish to do nothing but what was good and right.

Anschar, however, on his arrival, found the popular mind in an unfavourable state of excitement, the occasion of which might be considered, indeed, as a proof of the influence which Christianity had already begun to acquire. For it is manifest that the seeds of Christianity scattered in Sweden had, in the meanwhile, been operating even without the aid of teachers; and the very fact of the mixture of Christian and pagan elements among the people, testifies of the power which the Christian faith had already begun to exercise over the minds of men. On the one hand, there were some who decidedly espoused Christianity; on the other, some who were disposed to admit Christ among the other deities. Hence, in the zealous adherents to the old popular religion, the apprehension might be excited, that Christianity would work mischief to the worship of the gods. One individual, accordingly, from the midst of the people, had believed himself called to appear among the Swedes as a messenger from the national gods, to announce their displeasure at the neglect into which the worship of those deities had fallen to whom they were in-

\* Orici missum pariter et signum habuit secum, according to the Life of Anschar. What is to be understood by *signum*, as a sign of the royal credentials, is uncertain.

debtors for all their prosperity, and at the introduction of the worship of a strange God. If they wished for a new God, they should enrol among the number of their deities Erich, one of their ancient kings. This enthusiast found great acceptance with the people, and much zeal was manifested in founding a temple and a ritual for the new deity.

In this very business they were engaged, when Anschar arrived at Birka ; and he found a prevailing state of feeling most unfavourable to his object. His old friends advised him to abandon his enterprise, and be satisfied to get away with his life. But Anschar declared, that as to his life, he would abandon nothing for that ; he would gladly offer it for the cause of Christ, and also gladly suffer for that cause every species of torture. But resolved, even at the sacrifice of his life, to make every effort to procure an entrance for the gospel, he did not imprudently and fanatically rush on martyrdom, but had recourse to all the measures of Christian prudence to ward off the danger, and pave the way for the introduction of Christianity among the people. He invited king Olof to a feast in his own house, and made him presents with which he was gratified. Having thus gained his personal good-will, he begged that he might be permitted to preach and make known the Christian faith. The king, on his own part, was inclined to grant his request ; but his authority being limited, he could not decide, except by convoking an assembly of the people and consulting the gods by lot ; but he promised to favour the proposal in the assembly of his people. Everything now depended on their decision : and Anschar, with prayer and fasting, besought the Lord that he would so dispose the popular mind as to be favourable for the promotion of his own cause. Meantime, while engaged in celebrating mass, he felt such inward assurance, such a glow of pervading joy, that he said to a priest, his most intimate friend, "I am now sure of my cause ; grace will be with them ;" and his assurance was confirmed by the event.

At first, the king consulted with his nobles ; and they sought to explore the will of the gods by the use of the lot. The lot was favourable to the admission of Christianity. Next, the proposal was made, in the king's name, to the assembly of the people. While the discussion was going on with great earnestness and heat, a very aged man stepped out of the midst of the

assembly, and said: "Hear me, king and people; many of us, no doubt, have already been informed that this god can be of great help to those who hope in him, for many of us here have had experience of this in dangers at sea, and in manifold straits; why, then, should we spurn what is necessary and useful to us? Once, several of us travelled, for the sake of this religion, to Dorstede, and there embraced it uninvited.\* At present the seas have become dangerous by piracy. Why then should we not embrace what we once felt constrained to seek in distant parts, now that it is offered at our doors?" These words produced the desired effect. It was resolved that no obstacle should be offered to the introduction of the Christian worship of God. The resolution of this assembly of the people bound, it is true, only a part of the Swedes, the inhabitants of Gothenland; but in the other part also, Sweden in the more limited sense of the word, the resolution of the popular assembly turned out to be favourable. Anschar left behind him in Sweden the above-mentioned priest, Erimbert, to guide and direct the public worship. The king granted him a spot for building a church; Anschar purchased another, on which to erect a house for the priest. This being completed, he returned to his diocese in 854. Christianity had at first, it is true, but few decided followers, and these were for the most part merchants; but the recognition, widely diffused among the people, of Christ as a deity, and the impression left by the stories of his power, served to prepare the way for greater things in the future. Circumstances, similar to those which have been mentioned, contributed to lead men, in the first place, into the habit of regarding Christ as a mighty protecting deity, in war and in other dangers. The consultation of the lot had induced men to apply to him for succour, and the event had corresponded to the confidence reposed in him. Pagans were thus led to hold fasts and to distribute alms in honour of Christ.

\* The words to which we have already made allusion at page 267, and which are contained in s. 27 of the Life: *Aliquando quidam ex nobis Dorstadium adeuntes hujus religionis normam profuturam sibi sentientes, spontanea voluntate suscipiebant.* We might, to be sure, understand these words as meaning, when they had visited Dorstede on other business, they had there embraced Christianity; but the antithesis is more in favour of the rendering followed in the text.

## HORIK II. RECALLS THE MISSIONARIES.

In Denmark, however, a change happened in the same year unfavourable to the interests of the Christian church. King Horik, Anschar's friend, was killed in battle; and of his entire race but *one* descendant, Horik II., was left as regent over a small portion of the country. This person allowed himself to be governed by a certain stadtholder, Hari, a man hostilely disposed towards Christianity. The doors of the Christian church at Schleswig were closed. Christian worship was forbidden, the priest obliged to flee. Not long afterwards however Hari fell into disgrace, a person well disposed to Christianity, and who already, in the time of Horik I., had been of the greatest service to Anschar and to the cause of Christianity, attained to the highest influence. The king himself invited Anschar to send back the priest, since he was not less disposed to be the friend of Christ and of Anschar than the elder Horik. One thing which the pagans would not suffer before on account of their fear of enchantment, was now permitted; the church of Schleswig was provided with a bell. Liberty moreover was given to found a second church at Riven in Jutland, over which a priest was appointed.

Anschar was at all times extremely solicitous, that the missionaries sent out by him should set an example of disinterestedness. He advised them to ask nothing of any one; but rather to follow the example of the apostle Paul, and support themselves by the labour of their own hands, content with the little they needed for subsistence and clothing. He himself however generously gave them not only what they required for their own subsistence, but also a surplus for making presents and so creating friends, according to his own general practice of seeking, by means of presents, to gain influential patrons to the missions in Denmark and Sweden. His own diocese had but recently been rescued from paganism; and the wars with adjacent heathen tribes could not be otherwise than unfavourable to the growth of his people in Christian life and knowledge; hence he was still obliged to sustain many a hard conflict in his own field with pagan barbarism; of which the following is an example. Certain Christians who had been dragged off as slaves by pagan tribes of the North, had effected their escape from the harsh treatment they were compelled to suffer, and taken refuge in the adjacent territory of North Albingia. By some of the more powerful chieftains of that

district having recaptured them, sold some of them as slaves again to pagans or Christians, retaining others as servants in their own households. Anschar was indignant to find, that such things were done in his own diocese; but he was at a loss how to subdue the pride of these mighty ones, till by the impression of a dream in which Christ appeared to him, he was inspired with confidence. He repaired in person to the district where these events had occurred. With such equanimity and cheerfulness did he start on this expedition, that his attendants remarked they had never made so pleasant a journey, so happy did they find themselves in his society, so deeply were they conscious that the Lord was with them. He himself went straightway into the midst of the nobles; no one dared contradict him. The captives were collected from all sides, and immediately set free.

Anschar from his youth was exceedingly given to religious contemplation, to prayer, and other devotional exercises of life consecrated to seclusion. He had caused to be constructed for this purpose a particular cell, naming it his place of quiet and penitence, to which, with a few like-minded friends, he was in the habit of retiring. This indulgence, however, he never allowed himself, except when an opportunity was given him of recruiting himself for a short time from his labours among the heathen, his devoted toil as a preacher, and from the functions of his episcopal office, soon leaving again this beloved seclusion to engage once more in his public duties. He was in the habit of disciplining himself by severe mortifications; but at the same time he was not ignorant that humility is the soul of the Christian life; and observing how easily self-exaltation attached itself to such outward austerities, he begged God to save him by his grace from this danger.\* Too humble to entertain a wish of being able to perform miracles, he could not prevent the coming of sick persons from distant parts, who hoped to be restored by his prayers. Was a word, however, dropped in his presence, intimating that miracles had been wrought by his prayers in the healing of the sick, he said, "Could I deem myself worthy of such a favour from the Lord, I would pray him to vouchsafe me but this *one* miracle, that out of me by his grace he would make a good man."†

\* L. c. c. 35.

† Si dignus essem apud Dominum meum, rogarem, quatenus unum

After having laboured more than thirty-four years for the salvation of the heathen nations of the North, when past the age of sixty-four he was attacked by a severe fit of sickness, under which he suffered for more than four months. Amidst his bodily pains, he often said they were less than his sins deserved, repeating the words of Job, "Have we received good from the hand of the Lord, and shall we not receive evil?" His only regret was to find that the hope of dying as a martyr, with which that early dream had inspired him, was not to be fulfilled. An anxious concern for his diocese, for the souls of the individuals who stood round him, and especially for the salvation of the Danes and Swedes, occupied his mind to the last. In a letter written during this sickness, he recommended in the most earnest terms to the German bishops, and to king Lewis, strenuous efforts for the continuance of these missions. At last, having received the holy supper, he prayed that God would forgive all who had done him wrong. He repeated over, as long as he could speak, the words, "Lord be merciful to me a sinner; into thy hands I commit my spirit," and died, as it had been his wish to do, on the feast of the purification of the Virgin, February the third, 865.\*

Anschar's successor, his faithful disciple Rimbert, strove in all respects to imitate his master. He made several journeys, not without great danger, to Denmark and Sweden. To ransom Christ, captured by the pagan nations of the North, he parted with everything, even to the gold and silver vessels of the church, and to the horse, which he kept for his own convenience.†. But the circumstances of the times were most unfavourable to the missions among the Scandinavian tribes; for the pagans from those parts, by their desolating irruptions in quest of plunder, spread terror and havoc far and wide among the Christian nations, in Germany, England, and France, everywhere threatening with destruction the institutions of Christianity themselves. Yet the Danes, by their settlements in England, in the midst or on the borders of a Christian people, were in part brought more nearly within the range of Christian influences. Odo, an archbishop of Canterbury, who

miki concederet signum, videlicet ut de me gratia sua faceret bonum hominum.

\* See in the actis sanct. at the III. of February.

† See his Life, c. 17. Mabilion, acta sanct. sec. IV. P: II. p. 481.

lived about the middle of the tenth century, and was honoured as a saint, descended from a pagan Danish family. Christianity had taken strong hold of his mind while he was yet a young man, and he professed the Christian faith in opposition to the will of his parents.\*

In Denmark, during the first half of the tenth century, king Gurm, a usurper of the sovereign authority, manifested the most bitter hostility to everything belonging to the Christian church till in the year 934, when compelled by the power of the German emperor, Henry I., he promised to desist from his persecution of the Christians, and at the same time gave up the province of Schleswig to the German empire. This province now afforded, for the first time, a stable and secure seat for the Christian church. It was settled by a colony of Christians, thus affording a convenient point of transit for Christianity to Denmark. The archbishop Unni took advantage of this happy change, and again made a missionary tour to the North. His efforts, it is true, were unsuccessful to produce a change on the mind of king Gurm himself; but he found so much the readier access to the heart of his son Harald, who, under the training of his mother Thyra (a daughter of that first Christian prince Harald, and a zealous confessor of Christianity) had already been led to the Christian faith. Though he had not received baptism, he publicly declared himself in favour of Christianity; and as he shared the government with his father, the archbishop could travel, under his protection, into every part of Denmark, labouring for the establishment of the Christian church. This Harald, surnamed Blaatand, through the whole period of his reign of fifty years (from 941 onward), favoured the spread of Christianity. A war between this prince and the emperor Otho I. terminated in 972 with a treaty of peace, which also had a favourable influence towards the firm establishment of the Christian church in Denmark. Harald with his wife Gunild received baptism in the presence of the emperor, and the latter stood god-father at the baptism of the young prince Sueno (Sven Otto). But although Harald, before he became sole ruler, had shown himself favourable to

\* Accordingly we find a treaty concluded between the Danes settled in England and the English in the year 905, whereby the former bound themselves to renounce paganism and to adopt common ecclesiastical laws. See Wilkins' *Concilia Magnae Britannie*. T. I. fol. 202.

Christianity, yet we are not to infer from this that he had from the first regarded Christianity as the only true religion; but he proceeded by degrees, from a belief in the God of the Christians, as the mightiest deity with whom however the old national gods might also still be worshipped, to faith in the God of the Christians, as the only being to be worshipped, to the exclusion of the old national gods whom he finally regarded as no better than evil spirits. With respect to the manner in which this change was produced, we have the testimony of an ancient legend, widely diffused in the North, and handed down by popular tradition and by the historians,\* which doubtless is not without some foundation of truth. A priest by the name of Poppe, celebrated for his knowledge and his spiritual gifts, had come to Denmark from North Friesland to labour as a missionary. He happened to be present at a banquet in the palace, when among other topics the conversation turned upon the strife betwixt the old and the new religion, a subject which at that time greatly agitated the minds of men. Some of the Danes said, Christ was to be worshipped indeed as a God; yet the old national gods were mightier, for they had performed greater wonders. This Poppe disputed, and maintained, that Christ was the only true God, that those gods whom *they* worshipped were on the contrary evil spirits. The king who was still a believer in the old gods as well as in Christ, asked the priest whether he dared to prove this by a miracle; and then, as it is reported, proposed that he should submit to the judgment of God by the ordeal of the glowing iron. Now whatever may have actually occurred on this occasion, something at least was done or took place which

\* This story is found related already by monk Wittekind of Corvey, at the opening of the eleventh century. *Annal. l. III.* in *Meibom. script. rerum German. T. I.* p. 660; and in the same age by bishop *Ditmar of Merseburg*, in his *chronicle, l. II.* The historian, *Adam of Bremen*, who has drawn into his narrative many accounts concerning the ecclesiastical events of the North, says of Poppe: *Cujus veritate miraculi et tunc multa millia per eum crediderunt et usque hodie per populos et ecclesias Danorum celebre Popponi nomen effertur. c. 77. p. 56. ed. Lindenbruch. 1595.* To be sure, many important discrepancies are to be discovered in the report about these facts, as it regards persons, place, and time, which is nothing wonderful in a legend, handed down from mouth to mouth, and points to the different sources from which the story came; but it is impossible to make out the exact character of the facts lying at the foundation of the tale.

## STRUGGLE BETWEEN THE PAGAN AND CHRISTIAN PARTIES.

made a deep impression on Harald's mind, and contributed in a great measure to settle his convictions, and which seems also to have made a great impression on the untutored people. Poppo, who afterwards became bishop of Aarhus, is said to have laboured earnestly for the spread of Christianity in Denmark.\* Harald, both in respect to the development of his religious convictions and to the character of his conversion, may be compared with the emperor Constantine. Though he manifested great zeal for the spread of Christianity and of ecclesiastical institutions, and thus obtained a good name from those who regarded solely the external interests of the church, yet his cruel and perfidious acts show that Christianity had produced in him no moral change. The influence of Christianity, however, is certainly manifest in the manner in which he directed his efforts to restrain the rude passions of his people. It was first under his auspicious rule that Adaldag, archbishop of Hamburgh and Bremen, an active and zealous labourer both for the spread of Christianity and for the enlargement of his archiepiscopal province, was enabled to conceive and carry out the plan of consecrating several bishops for Denmark. One of these was bishop Liaflag, particularly celebrated for his devoted and influential activity.

The Christian church, however, was not to obtain the victory in Denmark without a fierce struggle in the first place between the pagan and Christian parties. The pagans were still quite numerous and powerful, and they were embittered in their feelings by the violent measures adopted by Harald for the universal introduction of Christianity. Of this tone of feeling, Sveno, the son of Harald, twice took advantage, and stirred up a rebellion against him. In 991 Harald perished in battle; and Sveno, who took the government, re-established the old religion, in compliance with the wishes of the party which had placed him on the throne. The Christian priests were expelled. Libentius, archbishop of Hamburgh and Bremen, attempted in vain, by messages and presents, to give the

\* Many names of places in the North perpetuate his memory, as for example, Poppholz, a forest between Flensburg and Schleswig, where, according to tradition, he built himself a hut. In a brook which flows by the spot, Hillegenbach, he is said to have baptized his disciples. See Pantopidan's *Annales ecclesiae Danicæ*, p. 158. The village Poppenbüttel, near Hamburgh, may be reckoned also to this class.

feelings of the young prince a different direction. When the Danes, under this monarch, conquered England, they expended their fury more particularly on the clergy and monks, and everything belonging to the church. In this Christian land, however, Sveno himself began to be more temperate in his opposition to Christianity, and even to return to the faith in which he had been educated. His son, Canute the Great, who reigned from the year 1014, was won over to Christianity by the influence of the Christian church in England, and especially of his consort, the English princess Emma, who was a devoted Christian. But religion was never able to obtain such mastery over him as to place an effectual check on the fierceness of his passions, his love of rule and thirst for conquest; and the form in which Christianity had been caught him was so mixed up with superstition, as to furnish him with ample means of pacifying an alarmed conscience. When he became king of England and Denmark, he applied himself with great zeal to the work of giving a stable foundation to the Christian church in his native country; and to this end employed the labours of many ecclesiastics sent over from England. He showed great respect for everything that pertained to the church,\* and by his efforts to promote its interests, sought to atone for the deeds of violence done by himself and his father. In the year 1022, he started on a pilgrimage to Rome, which he had long before meditated, for the purposes of devotion, and to bespeak the interest of the pope in behalf of his people.† He proposed to himself, if we may believe him, in this enterprise, objects worthy of a Christian prince, all which he made known in a letter addressed to his people. I have with prayer, he writes, consecrated my life to God himself, resolving from henceforth to act in all things as shall seem right before him; to rule with justice and piety over the people who are my subjects; and if, from the impulse of my youthful passions or from neglect, I have done many things in my past life con-

\* Fulbert, bishop of Chartres, who had received from him a present to his church, writes in reply: "Te, quem paganorum principem audieramus, non modo Christianum, verum etiam erga ecclesias atque Dei servos benignissimum largitorem agnoscimus." See ep. 97.

† As he says himself: Quia a sapientibus didici, sanctum Petrum apostolum magnam potestatem accepisse à Domino ligandi atque solvendi, clavigerumque esse regui coelestis: et ideo specialiter ejus patrocinium apud Deum expetere valde utile dixi.

trary to right, I now propose, with God's help, to retrieve every wrong. I therefore command my counsellors, never henceforth to countenance any injustice out of fear to me, or favour to any potentate whatever; nor to suffer anything of the kind to find admission into my kingdom. I also command the nobles in my kingdom, if they have any regard for my friendship or their own good, never to allow themselves in arbitrary acts of injustice and violence against any man, be he rich or poor. All, from the highest to the lowest class, shall experience exact justice according to the laws, and none shall depart from them, whether for the sake of gaining my royal favour from respect to the person of a nobleman, or for the purpose of collecting money from me."\*

It was only by slow degrees, that the rudeness of a people, who, as Adam of Bremen remarks, thought it disgraceful to shed tears for their own sins, or at the death of their dearest friends,† could be subdued by the influence of a church which trained its members by legal discipline, and it was only by gradual advances they could be brought into closer contact with the mild and humanizing spirit of Christianity.

As to the spread of Christianity in Sweden, the work commenced by Anscar had been there also interrupted by the same causes which had operated in the case of the Danish mission. For seventy years after Anscar's death, nothing beyond the transitory essays of Rimbert had been done for this object; when Archbishop Unni, who under King Harald Blaataud was performing a good and successful work in Denmark, extended his labours from that country to Sweden. He met, as it is reported, with a kind reception from the Swedish king Inge Olofson, and laboured among the people with good success; but he died at Birk, as he was about to return, in 936. Owing to the intimate connection with Denmark, where at that time the reign of Harald was so favourable to the spread of Christianity, the gospel at all points found its way also to Sweden. Laiadag, bishop of Ripon, and the bishop Odincar, whom archbishop Adaldag had ordained for this very

\* See Wilkins' *Concilia*, T. I. fol. 298.

† *Lacrimas et planetum cæteraque compunctionis genera, quæ flos salubria censemus, ita abominantur, ut nec pro peccatis suis nec pro caris defunctis ulli flere licet.*

purpose, are said to have been particularly active in promoting this work.

From this time, Christianity continued to make progress, though it often became intermingled with paganism. The Swedish king Olof Stautconnung, who reigned in the first half of the eleventh century, declared himself at the beginning decidedly in favour of Christianity, and endeavoured to place it on a firm footing in his kingdom. English clergymen, Sigfrid, Grimkil, and others, who came thither by the way of Norway (see on a future page) were active in these efforts. As the famous temple at Upsala was the central point from which the old cultus was continually preserved alive in the hearts of the people, the king resolved upon its destruction as the surest means of overthrowing the old popular religion. When this intention of the king came to be known to the people, they entered into an agreement with him in a popular assembly, that he should select for himself the best portion of the country for the purpose of founding in it the Christian church; but that everywhere else each should be allowed the free exercise of his religion. The king chose the western part of the country, and the first bishopric was founded at Skara in West-Gothland, over which an English clergyman by the name of Thurget was ordained by archbishop Unvan. But other ecclesiastics, coming over from England, attacked paganism with such inconsiderate zeal, as to arouse the fury of the heathen population. One Wulfred, who had already been the means of converting many, seized an axe and dashed to the ground a much venerated idol. He was attacked by a body of furious pagans, and died covered with wounds.\* The less violent zeal of king Jacob Amund, Olof's successor, contributed so much the more effectually to the spread of Christianity. His step-brother Emund, who acceded to the government in 1051, pursued the same course of policy; but he was not so inclined to acknowledge the superior ecclesiastical authority of the archbishop of Bremen, who acted as the pope's legate, and was very desirous of setting himself up as patriarch of the North. Osmund, the king's bishop, who had been ordained not in Bremen but in Norway, was for proceeding after a more independent way in ecclesiastical affairs, and the

\* Adam. Bremen. c. 41—44.

king encouraged him. The delegates of the archbishop of Bremen met with a very bad reception in Sweden; in consequence of which, the king and his bishop appeared in an unfavourable light to the advocates of the reigning church-system.\* It would have been attended with very important consequences to the shaping of the church and Christian development in the North, if the reaction of the northern spirit of freedom against dependence on the organs of the papacy had lasted for a longer period. But under Stenkil, Edmund's successor from the year 1059, the ancient relation to the church of Bremen was immediately restored. An event happened in the reign of this king, which must have given a favourable direction to the current of popular feeling with regard to Christianity. A priest of the temple at Upsula became blind. This man had heard a great deal said about the power of the Christian's god; and as there were many who worshipped Christ at the same time with the other gods, it would be no more than natural for him to conclude that this calamity had befallen him in consequence of the anger of the only god, whom he slighted and neglected, the God of the Christians; and as he had sought in vain for help from his own gods, he might now conceive the hope of obtaining relief by applying to the God of the Christians. While his mind was occupied with these thoughts, the Virgin Mary appeared to him in a dream, and promised him that his sight should be restored if he would come over to the worship of her Son. The priest recovered from his blindness, and went about everywhere proclaiming the almighty power of the Christian's God, and the vanity of idols. The archbishop of Bremen took advantage of these favourable circumstances, and having consecrated Adalward, one of his clergy, to the episcopal office, sent him to Sweden. Adalward entered upon his work with great zeal, and, in conjunction with bishop Egino of Schonen, made every exertion to bring about the destruction of the temple at Upsula, that strong-hold of paganism. They were ready to suffer every species of torture to effect this object; but when king Stenkil heard of their design, he deterred them, declaring that, if they carried it into effect, they would not only fall victims themselves to the wrath of

\* The accounts on this side, therefore, in Adam of Bremen, deserve no confidence.

the pagan people, but involve him and the whole church of Sweden in the greatest dangers.\*

According to the observation of a contemporary and eye-witness of these events, the canonical priest Adam of Bremen, much more might have been accomplished by the preachers in Sweden; for the Swedes were very susceptible to religious impressions, and indeed inclined already to recognize a divine power in Christianity, and to unite the worship of Christ with the old worship of the gods. Says Adam of Bremen:† "They receive the preachers of the truth with great kindness, if they are modest, wise, and able; so that the bishops are even admitted into their popular assemblies, where they gladly listen to their discourses concerning Christ and Christianity. And assuredly they might easily be converted to our faith, if bad teachers, who seek their own rather than the things of Jesus Christ, did not prove to them a stone of stumbling."

The Normans, strictly so called, had manifold occasions, in their predatory excursions to the remote East and South, of becoming acquainted with Christianity among the Christian people, with whom they came in contact. Many of their leaders had, among their other adventures in distant lands, come to the knowledge of Christianity; and in a life full of hazardous chances, and chequered fortunes, well calculated to awaken the consciousness of dependence on a higher power controlling human events, they were by various circumstances led to believe in the God proclaimed by Christianity. And when by the same means they became more fully confirmed in their faith, they were not wanting in a zeal to make known the God whom they worshipped to the rest of their countrymen; but they failed of possessing that kind of Christian knowledge, and that peculiar spirit and disposition of mind, which would lead them to the appropriate means for diffusing a religion like that of the gospel. The first who attempted to plant the Christian church in Norway was prince Hacon, before the middle of the tenth century. He had received a Christian education at the court of king Athelstan of England, and full of zeal for Christianity he returned when a young man to Norway, where he made himself master of the kingdom; but he found both the people and the nobles of the land blindly devoted to the reli-

\* L. c. c. 237.

† L. c. c. 229.

gion of Odin, and he would have soon lost the throne, which did not belong to him by the law of inheritance, if he had publicly shown at the very outset his zeal for Christianity. He was obliged to perform his exercises of Christian worship in secret, for which purpose he had obtained priests from England. Every week, he observed Sunday and Friday; the latter as a fast-day in remembrance of Christ's passion. He so arranged it, that the ancient national festival in honour of Odin, the three days festival of Jol or Yule in honour of the sun-god Freyr (the dies natalis invicti Solis of the Scandinavian tribes), which was usually celebrated with abundant feasting, should be transferred to the time of the Easter festival. Thus, without being disturbed, or exciting observation, he could keep his own festival in his own way. It was probably his design also, in some future day, to convert the heathen festival into the Christian one, since the very object of it, as in the case of the analogous festival among the pagans of the old Roman world, furnished an occasion for so doing. Having first gained over his most confidential friends to the side of Christianity, as soon as he had reason to believe that his power was sufficiently established, he proposed, in the year 945, before an assembly of the people, that the whole nation, great and small, masters and servants, men and women, should renounce idolatry and sacrifices, worship the only true God, and Jesus Christ his son, devote every Sunday to the exercises of religion, resting from all labour, and observe every Friday as a fast-day. Such a proposition to renounce at once the old religion and customs of the land could of course serve only to exasperate the minds of a people who were devoted to their ancient sacred institutions, especially as nothing had been done to prepare the way for such a measure by a previous inworking of Christianity upon their modes of thinking. The heads of households declared they could not gain a subsistence for themselves and their families if so much time were to be withdrawn from labour. The labouring class and servants declared, that by so much fasting they would have no strength left to work. In many of the speeches of the nobles, who took up the argument, zeal for the old national religion and repugnance to a new and foreign worship opposed to the customs of the people was most emphatically expressed, and the king's proposal repelled with universal

indignation. But the assembly was not satisfied to have the king desist from his attempts to introduce Christianity; it was considered indispensable to the prosperity of the land, that its king should take part in the public sacrifices. At the beginning of winter, when, according to an ancient custom, a great sacrifice must be offered, the king was required to repair with the rest to the place where the ceremony was to be performed; but he ate with his Christian friends, at a separate spot, to avoid defiling himself with the pagan sacrifice, and having his religious feelings annoyed by the sight of these heathen customs. This behaviour of the king, which seemed to cast a reproach on the festivals and customs of his people, was regarded by them as an insult to his subjects, to the king, his ancestors, and to the gods themselves. Sigurd, one of the most influential of the nobles, and who had been the most active in procuring the government for Hacon, stood forth as mediator between the king and his irritated people, and convinced him that, to avoid a popular insurrection, it would be necessary for him to yield in some measure to their demands. Hacon returned to his palace, and, taking his throne, the full goblets were presented, which, according to an ancient Scandinavian custom, must be drained dry in honour of the gods. Sigurd drank first to the king, in honour of Odin, then presented it, filled up again, to the king himself. The latter, before touching it to his lips, signed the cross over it, as a protection against the polluting effects of this approach to the service of demons. This act did not escape the notice of the assembled pagan nobles; and the only way in which Sigurd could pacify them was by roundly asserting that the king had merely signed over the cup the hammer of their own god Thor. But on the next day, the fury of the heathen people broke out more fiercely. As every Christian was forbidden to eat horse-flesh,\* it was now required of the king, with clamorous uproar, that he should taste of it; but he firmly refused. At length he consented, for form's sake, to touch his lips to the cloth which lay over the edge of the cauldron, in which the flesh had been seethed. Thus the king and his

\* At the time of the planting of the church in Germany by Boniface, the eating of horseflesh was already denounced as a heathen practice. Pope Gregory III. strictly forbade it, in his letter to Boniface of the year 732: "Immundum enim est atque execrabile." See Boniface, epp. p. 66.

#### DEATH OF PRINCE HACON.

people separated, mutually excited against each other; the former, because he had been forced to yield so much against his own religious feelings; the latter, because the king, after all, could not be brought back to the ancient sacred rites and customs. The celebration of the Yule-festival of this year led to a repetition of the same stormy and clamorous demands; and the king, on this occasion, fearing lest the fury of the people should break out in open rebellion, actually consented to eat part of the liver of a horse, and to drain all the cups drunk to its honour, without signing the cross over them. He repented, however, of having ever consented to do a thing so contrary to his conscience, and was already resolved to try the fortunes of war with the heathen party. The invasion of his country by a hostile power, which he met with the united strength of his people, was all that reconciled him to them. About the year 960, he was wounded mortally in battle. He now declared it to be his purpose, if he should survive, to leave his kingdom, retire to some Christian nation, and by tears, penitence, and a reformation of life, seek to obtain from God the forgiveness of his sins. The conviction bore like a heavy weight on his conscience, that he had denied the faith. His friends begged him to direct that his body should be transported to England, for interment according to the rites of Christian burial; but he said he was unworthy of it. Having lived as a heathen, he desired to be buried as one. The universal affection of the people for this king, who had died in battle for his country, would afterwards be likely to have a salutary reaction on their feelings towards a religion, to which he was so sincerely and zealously devoted.

When the Danish king Harald, in 967, made himself master of Norway, he sought to destroy paganism and introduce Christianity by the same violent measures as he had resorted to in Denmark; but here, as in the other case, these measures resulted only in a more violent reaction of paganism. The person whom he appointed stadtholder was Yarl Hacon, Sigurd's son, with whose assistance he had conquered the country; but as Hacon's real object was to serve his own interest, he rendered himself independent of his master, and, destroying all Christian foundations, showed great zeal in everywhere restoring again the pagan idolatry. But when he had fully secured possession of the sovereign power, he

## OLOF TRYGGWESON AND THANGBRAND.

nrendered himself odious by his oppressive tyranny, and the hatred with which he was regarded by the people opened the way for Olof Tryggweson, another Norwegian general, who was aiming at the sovereignty.

This Olof had travelled extensively in foreign lands; in Russia, Greece, England, and the neighbouring ports of Northern Germany. By intercourse with Christian nations, in his predatory excursions, he had obtained some knowledge of Christianity, and had been led, by various circumstances, to see a divine power in it. In some German port he had become acquainted, among others, with a certain ecclesiastic from Bremen, Thangbrand by name, a soldier-priest, whose temper and mode of life were but little suited to the spiritual profession. This person carried about with him a large shield, having on it a figure of Christ on the cross, embossed in gold. The shield attracted Olof's particular notice. He inquired about the meaning of the symbol, which gave the priest an opportunity of telling the story of Christ and Christianity, as well as he knew how. Observing how greatly Olof was taken with the shield, Thangbrand made him a present of it; for which the Norman chieftain richly repaid him in gold and silver. He moreover promised to stand by him, if he should ever need his assistance and protection, in the future. In various dangers, by sea and on the land, which Olof afterwards encountered, he believed that he owed his life and safety to this shield; and his faith in the divine power of the crucified one thus became stronger and stronger. At the Scilly Isles, on the south-west of England, he received baptism; upon which he returned to Norway, his country, fully resolved to destroy paganism. In England, he again met with the priest Thangbrand, who had been compelled to leave his country for having slain in single combat a man of superior rank. Olof took him along to Norway, in the capacity of a court clergyman. No good could be expected to result from his connection with a person of this character. Inclined of his own accord to employ violent measures for the destruction of paganism and the spread of Christianity, he would only be confirmed in this mistaken plan by Thangbrand's influence.

Olof was received in Norway with great joy, as the deliverer of the country from the oppressive yoke of Hacon; and, no

sooner had he obtained possession of the government, than he made the introduction of Christianity his chief concern. At an assembly of the people, the king stated that he should require of them such obedience as became freemen; first, they should be knights to the sovereign Lord, whom he himself served—of the King of kings, the being who created heaven and earth, and who would make them, from servants, brethren of his only begotten Son, and heirs of the kingdom of heaven. The kingdoms of the earth—he said—were founded for no other purpose, than to form the citizens, by good institutions, for being incorporated into the kingdom of heaven. Olof everywhere destroyed the heathen idols and temples, and invited men to be baptized. Of those who would not otherwise submit, he purchased obedience to his commands, by conceding to them various privileges; but he also made use of threats and violence to extort obedience, and in many cases exercised a revengeful cruelty. Paganism had, however, but very few martyrs, or Olof's violent measures would have turned to its advantage. His reign ended with a war against the united powers of Denmark and Sweden, in which, in the year 1000, he lost his life.

As the foreign rulers, who divided Norway between them, though friendly to Christianity, took no active part in the work of planting the Christian church in that country, the pagan party, which, under the former reign, had been suppressed by force, were now enabled to cast off the yoke imposed on them, and stand forth free again; but the other two parties—the decided Christians, and those who were for uniting the worship of Christ with that of the old national gods—could also freely express themselves. If, under Olof's reign, a more earnest and simple method had been pursued, to work upon the religious convictions of the people, such an interval would have proved a more important and salutary thing; since the previously-scattered seeds of Christianity, left to themselves, would, by their own inherent and divine vitality, have surely made progress, and freely developed themselves. But that spiritual element was wanting; and this short period of free development was followed again by a domination of the Christian church, arbitrarily forced upon the people from without; for Olof the Thick, who delivered Norway from her foreign yoke, came into the country in 1017, when already a decided Chris-

tian, with bishops\* and priests, whom he brought with him from England ; and his mode of procedure was still more despotic than that of the first Olof, and attended with more harshness and cruelty. He travelled through the whole country with a view to arrange everything himself that was necessary for the effecting of his own object, and to ascertain with exactness how far the cause had prospered ; and the obstinate were threatened with the confiscation of their goods, the maiming of their bodies, and various kinds of punishment by death. Hence it naturally happened that many submitted to baptism through fear, not changing their religion, but only practising it secretly ; though even this could not escape the jealous scrutiny of the king, and such renegades, who had never really been believers, incurred his particular displeasure. An unproductive season which, in 1021, followed, after a series of fruitful years, in many of the provinces, was looked upon by the heathen as a consequence of the anger of the gods, on account of the transition to the worship of the strange God ; and they who had submitted to baptism merely out of fear, began again to practise in secret more zealously the ancient rites, with a view to propitiate the angry deities. It came to the ears of the king that in the province of Thrand a number of festive banquets had been held in honour of the gods ; when, according to ancient custom, all the goblets were offered to the national gods, the Ase<sup>n</sup> ; sacrifices were offered ; the altars sprinkled with blood, and the gods supplicated to renew the productivity of the earth. He sent for a few delegates to come to him from that district, and state what reply they had to make to these accusations. The most considerable man among them endeavoured to put a good face on the matter ; he said they were nothing but the convivial meetings customarily held among the people of the land, and that words uttered on such occasions ought not to be construed so strictly as those

\* Adam of Bremen names, as particularly distinguished among these the bishops Sigfrid, Grimkil, Rodulf, Bernard. See c. 94, p. 56. He says of his zeal for the extermination of all pagan superstition : " Inter cetera virtutum opera magnum Dei zelum habuit, ita ut maleficos de terra disperderet, quibus quum tota barbaris exundet, præcipue Norwegia talibus monstris plena est. Nam divini et augures, magi et incantatores cæterique satellites antichristi ibi habitant. Illos omnes et hujus modi persequi decrevit, ut sublatiss' scandalis firmius in regno suo religio Christiana elucescere."

spoken in times of soberness. But when, by closer inquiry, Olof found out that the inhabitants of this province, though they had submitted to baptism, had almost universally continued to be pagans, and that they observed the usual times of sacrifice in autumn, winter, and spring, in order to obtain a favourable season, he fell upon them unexpectedly, while engaged in celebrating one of their spring festivals, and took terrible vengeance on those who had deceived him. As many, through fear, now promised sincere obedience, he founded churches here, over which he appointed priests, who were to make all the arrangements required for the due introduction of Christianity\*.

Dread for the most part of Olof's violent measures, induced obedience, indeed, though there was no sincerity in it; while from the boors, inflamed with zeal for their divinities, and urged on by the speeches of their leaders, he occasionally met with an obstinate, though short-lived resistance. In the province of Dalen was a powerful man, named Gudbrand (after whom the whole province was called Gudbrandsdalen),† a zealous champion of the old religion. This person assembled the people as Olof approached, and telling them that they ought not to wonder that the earth had not yet opened to swallow up the profane monster who presumed to treat the gods with such insolent contempt, said they had only to bring out the great Thor (a colossal idol), and let him appear in public, when Olof and his whole force would melt away like wax. The words were received by the multitude with a shout of exultation; and, clashing together their shields, the crowds of peasantry marched forth to meet the king, who soon put them to flight. Gudbrand's son was taken prisoner; and the king, after detaining him for a few days, sent him back to his father, to announce his own approach. Said Gudbrand, "Who, then, is this God of the Christians, whom no man has seen, or can see? We have a god whom every one can see, the great Thor, in whose presence all must tremble." A meeting was agreed upon, where each party was to prove the power of its own god. Olof prepared himself for this meeting, the night

\* See Tormodi Torfaci hist. Norveg. I. II. c. 21. I follow, in this whole account, the extracts from Northern sources, contained in this instructive work.

† Stift Aggershuus on the borders of Stifts Bergen and Drontheim.

previous, by prayer. Next day the colossal image of Thor, overspread with gold and silver, was drawn to the public place, and around it the pagans assembled. The king directed Celbein, one of his guard, a man of gigantic stature and great muscular strength, to stand near him. Gudbrand first made a speech, challenging the Christians to produce evidence of the power of their God, and pointing them to the great Thor, the sight of whom filled them all with alarm. Upon this Olof spoke: "You threaten us with your deaf and blind god, soon to meet with a sorry end. But lift up your eyes to the heavens; behold our God, of whom ye say he can be seen by no one, how majestically he reveals himself in the radiant light." The sun burst forth; and at the same moment Celbein, as previously directed by the king, demolished with a single blow the mighty idol. The monster fell, crumbled into small fragments, out of which crept a great multitude of mice, snakes, and lizards. Gudbrand was no longer disposed to stake everything upon a god that could not help himself.\*

The embittered state of feeling occasioned by Olof's despotic severity probably facilitated the conquest of the country by Canute, king of Denmark and England. The banished Olof returned, and prepared himself for a new struggle. He would receive none but Christians into his army. He caused the shields and helmets of his soldiers to be emblazoned with the sign of the cross, and gave them as his watch-word, "Onward, warriors of Christ, the cross and the king." He was mortally wounded in battle on the 29th of July, 1033; and soon after his death honoured by the Christians as a martyr. The fame of the miracles wrought at his tomb spread far and wide.† The day on which he died, the 29th of July, was universally observed as a festival by the people of the North. The veneration in which Olof was held could not fail to have a salutary reaction on the tone of popular feeling towards Christianity. Adam of Bremen says of the Normans, who, by the influence of Christianity, were first induced to leave off their piratical expeditions:‡ "After receiving the gospel, educated in better

\* See Tórmód. Torf. I. II. c. 23.

† Adam of Bremen says of his tomb, Hist. Eccles. c. 43: "Ubi usque hodie pluribus miraculis et sanitatibus, quæ per eum flunt, Dominus ostendere dignatus est, quanti meriti sit in cœlis, qui sic glorificatur in terris."

‡ De situ Danie, c. 96.

schools, they learned to love peace, and to be contented with their poverty."

A hundred years after the occupation of Iceland\* by a Norman colony, the first attempt was made to transplant Christianity to that island. Thorwald, son of Codran, from a noble Icelandic family, roved the seas as a pirate, as was customary with sons of the first Norman families; he distinguished himself, however, from others of this class by devoting all he gained, beyond what was necessary for his own subsistence, to the redemption of captives.† This trait of philanthropy spoke of better feelings in the heart of the rude Icelander, and formed, as we may presume, the medium of access through which Christianity reached him. His adventures brought him to Saxony, where he fell in the way of a certain bishop, Friedrich,‡ who instructed him in Christianity, and baptized him. His conversion to Christianity amounted, indeed, to something more than such conversions usually did among these rude inhabitants of the North, who, while sojourning in distant lands, were induced to become Christians; for the bishop Friedrich had probably given him better instruction, and he showed the influence of Christian principles by renouncing piracy. Still it appears evident from his conduct that he had by no means as yet experienced that

\* Where, perhaps, even earlier than this, the Irish monks, who wandered everywhere and defied every hardship, had endeavoured to form an establishment; since it is intimated in old Northern legends that the Normans, when they settled in this island, found there already Christians (Papas, priests), Irish books, bells, bishops' staffs, &c. See Münter's *Geschichte der Einführung des Christenthums in Dänemark und Norwegen*, Bd. I. S. 520; with which compare the remarks of monk Dicuil of Ireland, in 825, whose book *De mensura orbis terræ*, was first published by Walckenaer, Paris, 1807. He speaks (*De mensura*, p. 29), of the Thile ultima (probably Iceland), in qua aestivo solsticio sole de canceri sidere faciunt transitum, nox nulla. Brumali solsticio perinde nullus dies. He then relates that ecclesiasties, thirty years before, had resided there from the 1st of February to the 1st of August.

† See the account of the introduction of Christianity into Iceland, *Kristni-Saga*—a narrative drawn from old traditions. The original Icelandic, with a Latin translation, published at Copenhagen in 1773.

‡ As he had been absent six years from his diocese, he could not have been bishop of any particular see; but if he had really received episcopal ordination, as from various circumstances it may be inferred that he had, we must suppose that he had been ordained bishop of a church yet to be formed among the heathen—*episcopus regionarius*.

moral change which Christianity aims to effect—the stormy passions which swayed the rude pagan of the North were not subdued. In 981 bishop Friedrich, in company with this Icelandic chieftain, his new convert, visited Iceland, in the hope, in which he was encouraged by Thorwald, that he should be able to win over multitudes to Christianity. The first winter he spent in Thorwald's family, who laboured for some time without success, to induce his father to receive baptism. The old Codran worshipped more particularly, as his tutelary god, a stone,\* possessed, as he imagined, of wonderful virtue, and refused to put faith in the God of the Christians, until it should be proved that he was mightier than his own. The bishop prayed over the stone, and it fell in pieces. This proved to the heathen the power of the Christian's God. So states the later tradition which, no doubt, may have mixed up the true facts of the case with fiction; still in substance it accords fully with the character and manners peculiar to the infancy of those tribes of the North; and similar stories were recorded in connection with the more authentic histories of missions among people at the same stage of culture. To the same class belongs an event which took place when Thorwald and the bishop attended the customary autumnal festival (see above). On this occasion two of those men called Berserkers, who, in certain states of frenzy or possession, were supposed capable of doing extraordinary things, rushed frantically in, and proposed to pass unharmed between two fires. They did not escape, however, without a scorching; which was regarded as an effect of certain words spoken by the bishop over the fires; for looking upon these enthusiasts as men possessed of evil spirits, he had pronounced a prayer over the lighted pyres, to confine the power of the demon. Both these men fell victims to the popular fury; but such occurrences, as it turned out in the end, left but a transient impression, except on a few individuals. Till the bishop could readily express himself in the Icelandic dialect of the common old German stock, the preaching to the heathen was done by Thorwald. The latter stood forth also as the advocate of Christianity before an assembly of the people; but he was not well received. Many of the Scalds (the national poets), composed satires against Christianity and its

\* We may here call to mind the *lapides uncti* of the ancients.

preachers. Thorwald, yielding to the impulse of his passions, took bloody revenge on two of them for their defamatory songs, in spite of the efforts of the bishops to pacify him, by giving a milder interpretation of the equivocal language which had been used. Within a period of five years they travelled in company over the whole island, often followed and stoned by the people, who threatened to arrest and accuse them as enemies to the national gods. In the northern parts of the island alone they found many who were willing to be baptized, others who could not as yet be persuaded to submit to baptism — whether because they were not fully convinced of the truth of Christianity, or because this custom of baptism by immersion appeared to them strange and foreign,\* or because for the reasons already explained, they wished to put off the rite to the end of life.† Over these they made the sign of the cross, and then admitted them to the class of catechumens. Others broke in pieces their idols, and ceased to pay tribute to the idol-temples; yet without becoming Christians.‡ One of the new Christians, Thorwald Spakbōdvarssun, went so far as to build a church upon his estate; and the bishop appointed a priest for it, which produced a great excitement among the pagans. And whether the bishop now supposed that he could no longer remain in Iceland and hope to escape the fury of the heathen, who threatened him and his companions with death, or whether he wished to expend the rest of his labours on Norway, with the assistance of Thorwald, who belonged to a kindred race, the fact was, they went over to that country in the year 986. The bishop, however, finding it impossible to tame the revengeful spirit of his warlike companion, renounced his fellowship, and retired home to his native land.

The king Olof Tryggwe-on, of whom we have already spoken, felt himself bound to labour for the spread of Christianity, not

\* If lustrations by water were already in use among the northern pagans, and a certain magical consecration was conceived to be connected with them (see e. g. the words of the Edda. "Si mihi homo puer aqua est adspergendus, ille non dejicitur, etsi in aciem veniat, non cadet homo ille ab ensibus." Vol. III. of the edition of Copenhagen, 1828, p. 141), baptism could not be universally regarded as a strange and foreign rite.

† The cruce signare, Primisigning. See l. c. c. I. near the end; and c. II. p. 15. Comp. Finni Johannaci Hist. Eccles. Island. T. I. Hafniæ. 1772, p. 42, note C.

‡ See Kristni-Saga, c. II. near the end.

only in Norway but also in the islands peopled by Norman colonies. He was moved to this by a natural interest for the good of those who belonged to the same national stock, and also by a concern for his own subjects, exposed, by their intercourse and connection with the pagan colonies of Norway, to be infected by the paganism still prevailing there. Now as there were many Icelanders at the court of Orlof, who by his means had first become acquainted with, and then been converted to, the Christian religion, he persuaded one of these, by the name of Stefner, who belonged to one of the respectable families of Iceland, to undertake the work of introducing Christianity into his native land. Here then was the case of a layman going to his countrymen in the character of a missionary. This happened in the year 996. He travelled over the whole island, but found none who were inclined to listen to his preaching. Even his own family declared against him. Finding it impossible to effect any good as a teacher, he contented himself with destroying the temples and idols. In this way he roused against him the wrath of the pagans, and his vessel, which lay at anchor in the port, having been loosed from her moorings and driven by a storm to sea, these pagans interpreted it as a punishment sent upon him by their god Freyr. At an assembly of the people it was decreed that every man, from the fourth degree of kin, should be bound to prosecute the Christians, as enemies of the gods. Thus the ties of blood were to be sundered by abandoning the national divinities.\* Several of his kinsmen now appeared as accusers of Stefner, and being condemned, he was forced, in 997, to leave his country and return back to king Olof. Another Icelander of the higher class, Hialtti, was banished from the country for composing a song in ridicule of the Icelandic divinities; and he, with his step-father Gissur, repaired to Norway. Here those Icelanders generally, who were obliged to leave their country on account of their zeal for Christianity, met with so much the more friendly reception from king Olof. Other Christians, who still remained in Iceland, did not fall away from the faith, though they dared not perform openly the rites of Christian worship. The first want of success, however, did

\* A crime of such a nature as to occasion a severance of this sort was designated by the name of Fröndafion.

#### THANGBRAND IN ICELAND.

not induce the king to abandon his purpose, and he took advantage of an opportunity which soon presented itself of carrying it into execution.

Thangbrand, the worthless priest of whom we have already spoken, having received an appointment from the king on a certain island, after squandering away the property of the church, had endeavoured to cover up his lavish expenditures by extortions made on the pagans. Having thus fallen into disgrace, no other course remained for him to regain the favour of his monarch, but to offer his services for the work of transplanting Christianity to Iceland. He first visited that island, as an ambassador of king Olof, in the year 997. A person less fitted to procure an entrance for Christianity to the hearts of men could scarcely be found. If he effected anything it could only be outward conversions, brought about by constraint or other foreign means addressed to the senses. As soon as it became known that Thangbrand and his associates were Christians, no man would have anything to do with them, not even so much as to show them a port. King Olof's authority, however, procured for them a favourable reception from Sido-hallr, a man of some importance, who was perhaps already favourably disposed to Christianity in consequence of what he had heard about it. On the festival of St. Michael, while Thangbrand was celebrating mass with great pomp, in his tent, Hallr felt a curiosity to witness these ceremonies. The scene made a strong impression on the pagan's mind. This prepared the way for his conversion to the Christian faith, after which he stood by the priest Thangbrand in his labours. The latter found means to address the people at their popular assemblies. He travelled through the country and baptized many, but the bards (the Sealds) persecuted him with their sarcastic songs, as an enemy to their gods. The warlike Thangbrand, having revenged these insults by killing two of the bards, was pursued as a murderer and compelled, after remaining two years in Iceland, to return, in 999, to his king. He complained of the insults which he had received while acting as the king's ambassador: he described the Icelanders as obstinate and incorrigible enemies to Christianity. By this account Olof was transported with anger; he resolved to take severe retribution on the pagan Icelanders who had just come to visit him. He commanded them to be thrown into chains; but the

two Christians from Iceland, already mentioned, Hiallti and Gissur, endeavoured to pacify him. They informed him that Thangbrand had made himself odious by his violent mode of procedure; that the Icelanders, if properly treated, might easily be won over to Christianity; and they reminded him of a characteristic remark of his own, evincing at once the warmth of his zeal for the spread of Christianity and its lack of knowledge, that "he was ready to forgive a crime of any magnitude, if the transgressor would consent to be baptized." He then agreed to pardon all Icelanders if they would embrace Christianity. He detained only four of the most considerable men as hostages, and all the Icelanders near his court submitted to baptism. In the spring of the year 1000, Gissur and Hiallti engaged in a mission to their native land, accompanied by the priest Thormud and some other ecclesiastics. They carried with them building materials, supplied by king Olof, for the erection of a church in Iceland. Such as had remained Christians in secret now came forth openly. Hiallti, Gissur, and Hallr of Sido, stood high in the esteem of their countrymen, and knew how to approach them. Thus was formed an important Christian party; and this was fought by a pagan one with the utmost exasperation of feelings. A religious war seemed inevitable, but was prevented by the influence of the prudent followers of the pagan party, and of those who, though not as yet Christians, had lost their confidence in the power of the gods.\* That this last was the case with numbers appears from the following example. The frightful account of the eruption of a volcano, having been seized upon by the pagans and represented as an evidence and token of the anger of the gods, one of their own priests, Snorro, exclaimed, "What was it, then, which excited the anger of the gods, when the rock on which we now stand first emitted flames?"

The pagans resolved, as was customary on occasions of great

\* Even before the influence of Christianity had wrought this in Iceland, it is reported of many that the original consciousness of God had so far pierced through the fog of idolatry as to determine them to pay religious homage only to the creator of the sun. See Münter's Church History of Denmark and Norway, vol. I. p. 523. To such cases Adam of Bremen probably alludes, when he says of the Icelanders: "Licet ante susceptam fidem naturali quadam lege non adeo discordarent a nostra religione." Hist. eccles. p. 150.

calamity, that each of the four districts of the island (answering to the four points of the compass) should offer two men in sacrifice to the gods. Upon this Hialhti and Gissur said to their friends:—"The pagans devote as sacrifices to their gods the most abandoned men, and cast them headlong from precipices. We will choose an equal number from the best of the people, who, in the true sense, shall devote themselves as offerings to our Lord Christ, shining forth to all as conspicuous examples of Christian life and confession." The proposal was adopted and executed. Conformably to the Icelandic constitution of government, each several district had its priests, who presided not only over the religious rites of the people, but also over the legislation and the administration of justice; who had to direct the deliberations when new laws were proposed at the national assemblies, to promulgate these laws and see to their execution. Now, as the pagan laws were no longer agreeable to the Christians, the latter chose Sido-Hallr as their head, requesting him to draw up for them a schedule of laws in accordance with the Christian point of view. But in this way the people would be divided into two opposite parties, not only in religion but in their civil affairs. Such a schism, which certainly might lead to a civil war, Sido-Hallr wished to avoid. For this purpose he repaired to the priest \* Thorgeir, then holding the office of chief supervisor over the legislation, who was probably himself already inclined to Christianity. It was agreed that he should propose new laws for the whole nation, and that among these he should adopt three in favour of Christianity; while it was conceded that, in some other respects, he might allow indulgence to the deep-rooted paganism, leave many things still undetermined, and the whole to the reforming influence of Christianity after it had once become firmly rooted. As a compensation for carrying out this project, Sido-Hallr paid him a certain amount of geld. Thorgeir now summoned a national council. When convened, he represented before it the great danger which must accrue to the nation in case two different legislatures and two governments should spring up within it: it would sow the seeds of a civil war, which would fill the island with desolation; better far that both parties should make mutual conces-

\* Goda.

† The office of Lögsögn.

sions, and so unite in a legislation which should be valid for the whole island. These representations were favourably received, and both parties came to an agreement that they would adopt the laws proposed by Thorgeir, which were as follows:—

1. All Icelanders should submit to baptism and profess Christianity.
2. All idol-temples, and images standing in public view, should be destroyed.
3. Whosoever publicly offered to idols, or exercised the pagan rites of worship, should be banished. But for any man to practise the pagan religion in private, should not be reckoned as a crime. To eat of horse-flesh,\* and to expose children,† were not as yet forbidden by law: and the ancient customs, not at variance with Christianity, were to remain.

Thus, while Christianity was recognised as the public religion, paganism might still subsist along with it, as a private religion, among a portion of the people; and so one thing and another, in manners and customs at variance with Christianity, might still endure. Through the influence, however, of those principal men of the nation who united with zeal for Christianity a warm love for their country, Christianity was gradually introduced more and more into the life of the people. King Olof, the Norwegian saint (see above), endeavoured to make his code of ecclesiastical laws, drawn up by bishop Grimkil, valid also in Iceland; and on learning that the exposure of infants and other customs springing out of paganism, still prevailed there, he sent, at the very beginning of his reign, an embassy to Iceland for the purpose of inviting the priest, who then administered the office of Lögsögu in Ice-

\* See above, p. 405.

† As in China and the islands of the South Sea, so also among these Scandinavian tribes, it was customary, and permitted by law, to expose and leave to perish such children as the parents did not choose to bring up, which was done not merely by such as lacked means of subsistence for their offspring, but also by such as found something objectionable in the make and shape of their bodies. It is true that in the case of the Icelanders, even in their condition of paganism, some indications are to be discovered of a reaction of the moral feelings, more developed among them than among the South Sea islanders, against this unnatural custom. Yet it was only by the influence of Christianity that it could be wholly suppressed. How difficult this was, appears from the fact, that even when men ventured to forbid the public exercise of pagan rites, yet they dared not extend the prohibition to this point. See on this subject the remark in Fiani Johanni, Hist. eccles. Island. T. I. p. 68.

land, to abolish those heathenish customs.\* At first foreign bishops only laboured in Iceland, without any fixed diocese. Gissur, however, who had done so much for the diffusion of Christianity in his native land, saw clearly that Christianity could not exist and flourish without culture. † He sent his son Isleif to Erfurt to be educated in the school there established. This person, on his return, imported the seeds of knowledge into his country. By the choice of the people he was consecrated bishop in 1056, and established his episcopal see at Skalholt, a place fixed upon by his father. This was the first episcopal see established in Iceland; the second was founded at Holum in the year 1107. The first bishops, sprung from the ancient and principal families, and who had received their education in foreign parts, were enabled through their great influence (being reverenced as fathers and looked up to for counsel and advice on all subjects), to act so much the more efficiently for the extirpation of the remains of heathenism. † The historian of the Northern church, the canon Adam of Bremen, says concerning the Icelanders, at the end of this period—“ As in their simplicity they lead a holy life, and seek nothing beyond what nature has bestowed on them, they can cheerfully say with the apostle Paul, ‘ having food and raiment, let us be therewith content’ (1 Tim. vi. 8); for their mountains serve to them as cities, and their springs are their delight. Happy people, whose poverty no one despises, and happiest in this, that at the present time they have all received Christianity. Many things are remarkable in their manners; but above all their charity, which places all they own in common ~~alike~~ <sup>alike</sup> to the foreigner and to the native.” †

After the same manner Christianity was propagated from Norway, under the reigns of the two Olofs, to a series of Northern islands dependent on this kingdom—to the Orcades §

\* See Tormod. *Torf. hist. Norveg.* 1. II. c. 2.

† Adam of Bremen: *Episcopum habent pro rege, ad cuius nutum respicit omnis populus, quicquid ex Deo, ex scripturis, ex consuetudine aliarum gentium ille constitut, hoc pro lege habent.*

‡ See *Hist. eccles.* the edition above cited.

§ On the islands of the Orcades, establishments had perhaps been founded already by the Irish monks (see above, p. 412), till they were driven away by fear of the Normans. The above-mentioned Dicuil speaks (p. 30) of the islands in septentrionali Britanniae oceano, quae a septentrionalibus Britanniae insulis duorum dierum ac noctium recta

and to the Faroe islands. King Olof Tryggweson sent for a man, by the name of Sigmund Bresterson, who, after having suffered from the period of childhood a variety of misfortunes, and passed through strange adventures, had attained to great power in the Faroe islands. To this man he promised his friendship and great honours if he would embrace Christianity ; assuring him, however, that by so doing, instead of injuring himself, he would secure a title to the happiness which Almighty God would bestow on him, as on every other man who kept his commandments from love to the Holy Spirit—viz. to reign for ever with his beloved Son, the King of kings, in the highest bliss of the kingdom of heaven. Sigmund might the more easily be persuaded to embrace Christianity, as he seems to have been convinced of the vanity of idolatry, even before he had found anything better to satisfy his religious need. It was this circumstance which had encouraged Olof to hope that by his means the way might be prepared for establishing Christianity in the Faroe islands, for he had heard that he was not in the habit of sacrificing to the gods like other pagans.\* He, with his followers, all received baptism—then first was he instructed in Christianity. He returned home, in 998, with ecclesiastics supplied by the king ; but on proposing to his people that they should all renounce idolatry and submit to baptism, he met with the most determined opposition ; and it was not till after he had overcome it by force, in 999, that he could induce the people of Faroe to be baptized ; hence the majority remained pagans in their way of thinking, and relapsed into idolatry as soon as they had nothing more to fear. Sigmund, however, caused a church to be erected on his own estate, and continued to labour for the spread of Christianity. Meanwhile another principal man of these islands, named Thrand, who had resisted Sigmund from the first, and only yielded to superior force, turned back again with his followers to paganism. King Olof the saint took great pains,

navigatione. plenis velis assiduo feliciter adiri queunt; and he says of them, in quibus in centum ferme annis eremite ex nostra Scotia navigantes habitaverunt. Sed sicuti a principio mundi deserterem semper fuerunt, ita nunc causa latronum Normannorum vacue anchoritis plena innumerabilibus avibus ac diversis generibus multis nimis marinaram avium.

\* See the Færeyingia-Saga, published by Mohnike. 1833. p. 321, 322.

also, to place the Christian church in these islands on a firmer footing.

Under the reign of Olof Tryggweson, the seeds of Christianity were first conveyed by Leif, an Icelander, in the year 999, to Greenland, which had been discovered and peopled but a short time before. In 1055, a certain Albert was sent to the Greenlanders, as their bishop, by Adalbert, archbishop of Hamburg or Bremen; and in a bull by pope Victor II., defining the archiepiscopal district of the Hamburg and Bremen church, Greenland was assigned to this see.\* In 1059, Ion or John, a Saxon or Irish bishop, is said to have made an attempt to introduce Christianity among the inhabitants of one of the three coasts of North America discovered by adventurers from Iceland, but to have died there as a martyr.†

Several tribes of Tartarian and Slavonian origin, dwelling on the borders of the East-Roman empire, were in this period brought over to Christianity. Among these were the Bulgarians, who, coming from the central parts of Asia, and spreading themselves along the borders of the Roman empire, had among Slavonian nations, adopted their language and customs. Becoming involved during the ninth century in frequent wars with the Greek empire, in which they carried off Christians, particularly monks and ecclesiastics, as captives, they were instructed by them in Christianity. In an irruption of the Bulgarians into the Roman empire, A.D. 813, accompanied with wide devastations and the capture of Adrianople, they dragged off, with other captives, a bishop. This person formed the companions of his captivity into a church, who remained true to their faith, even in the midst of heathens, and earnestly laboured for its spread. Many of them perished as martyrs; among these, the bishop himself.‡ Then, somewhat later, a captive monk, Constantine Cypharas, endeavoured to carry forward the work thus commenced, though not with any great success. It so happened, however, that in the year 861, the empress Theodora, for some special reason or other,

\* See Munter's *Geschichte der Einführung des Christenthums in Dänemark und Norwegen*, Bd. I. s. 558.

† L. c. s. 561.

‡ See Constantin. *Porphyrogenit.* Life of the emperor Basilus Macedo, c. IV. Hist. *Byzant.* ed. Venet. *continuatores post Theophanem*, p. 100

was led to redeem this monk from bondage, and to procure his return to his native country. At this juncture a sister of the Bulgarian prince Bogoris resided at Constantinople, whither in early youth she had been conveyed as a captive, and where she had been brought up and educated as a Christian ; and the negotiations to effect the redemption of the above-mentioned monk resulted also in her being sent back to her friends. She now considered it her duty to complete the work for which the monk Constantine Cypharas had prepared the way, by labouring to gain over her brother to the Christian faith ; but surrounded as he was by rude Bulgarians, and dreading, if he should desert the faith of his fathers, an insurrection of his people, she found him little inclined to listen to her exhortations. But outward circumstances favoured her pious efforts. A famine, severely oppressive to the country, softened the heart of Bogoris, so that he became more susceptible to religious impressions, and was even induced to seek help from the God of the Christians. Having remarked the fondness of the prince for painting, his sister availed herself of this circumstance, and sent for Methodius.\* a monk and skilful artist, probably the same who is so deservedly celebrated for his efforts generally to effect the conversion of the Slavonian tribes. Bogoris, being an ardent lover of the chase, commissioned this monk to paint a hunting scene in one of his palaces ; but instead of it, he drew a sketch of the last judgment, and the impression it produced on the mind of Bogoris furnished an opportunity for making him better acquainted with Christianity. He was baptised between 863 and 864 ;† and as the absent Greek emperor Michael stood as

\* The arguments adduced by Schlozer, in his edition of Nestor's Russian Annals. P. III. p. 171, against the identity of the two, are, to say the least, not conclusive, though it is certainly singular that Méthodius, if he laboured in Bulgaria as a missionary, did not bestow more pains on this mission, as we might expect him to have done from his mode of procedure in other Slavonian missions, of which we shall speak hereafter.

† A chronological mark is furnished by the letter of Photius to the bishops of the East, which contains his charges against the Latin church ; for in it he says, that two years had not yet elapsed since the conversion of the Bulgarians, when the false teachers of the western church found entrance among them, which must have happened shortly before he wrote this letter, *οτινα γαρ ειπεν τον ιδρυτα εις την ιερουσαλημ*

PHOTIUS' LETTER TO BOGORIS.

His god-father, he took from him the name Michael.\* Photius, who was then patriarch of Constantinople, wrote him a long letter, exhorting him to prosecute the work which had been commenced, and to take every pains for the conversion of his people; at the same time expounding to him the essential parts of Christian faith and morals. In the beginning of his letter, he unfolded at large the matters belonging to church orthodoxy, as contradistinguished from the different heresies, to which he added a brief history of the general councils of the church, things which the rude Bulgarian prince was neither prepared to understand nor to make use of in any way for the promotion of his equally rude Christianity. In the second part of his letter, he explained, indeed, the requirements of Christian morality, representing love to be the fulfilling of the law, and saying many things which were well adapted to the capacity and wants of the Bulgarian prince; but he said a great deal besides which was wholly out of place. Among other councils of state-craft, he gave the following, with reference to the political divisions in the Bulgarian nation, then no doubt on the eve of breaking out in consequence of Bogoris' defection from the national religion. "Concerted insurrections, which cannot easily be suppressed, it is the better plan to ignore and allow to be forgotten, rather than attempt to suppress them by force. For the effect of the contrary course is often only to add fuel to the fire, and to cause serious dangers, and great damage, even after the victory has been won; but appeasing the storm by gentle measures avoids both the danger and the injury, while it promotes humanity and wisdom."† On the whole, it appears quite evident that the learned and highly accomplished Photius could not so well adapt himself to the condition of this people, as a Western bishop of simpler feelings, but more accustomed to associate with men at a similar stage of culture.

But the Bulgarian prince Michael, following no doubt his

\* οὐδὲν τῶν Χριστιανῶν τιμῶντος Θεονομίαν. Pho.ii epistolæ. Lond. 1651, ed. Montacute. p. 49.

\* See Constant. Porphyrogenit. l. IV. c. 14 et 15, l. c. p. 75, and Joseph. Genes. reg. l. IV. p. 97, ed. Lachmann, in the new edition of the Corpus Hist. Byzant. by Niebuhr.

† See the first long letter of Photius, in the edition of these letters by Richard Montacute, bishop of Norwich. Lond. 1651. fol. 40.

trade notions of Christianity, proceeded to force his people to change their religion. The consequence was a revolt against his authority.\* He succeeded in suppressing it; and the cruel revenge which he now took on the guilty, proves the slight and superficial character of his Christianity. He ordered that the principal men who had been concerned in this insurrection should be executed. On the part of the Greek church, there seems to have been an entire want of the proper care which was needed in order to the thriving of Christianity among so rude a people. The deficiency of clergy induced a Greek layman who happened to be among them to set himself up as their teacher, pretending that he was a priest; and by him many were baptized. But when they found how they had been deceived by him, they cut off his nose and ears; and after inflicting upon him many other personal injuries, banished him from the country.† Other Greeks introduced various strange stories and superstitions among the people. They boasted of being able to foretel all future events from the Scriptures.‡ They pretended that the true chrism was to be found in their country alone, whence it was distributed through the whole world.§ Teachers of various nations and from distant regions came also to Bulgaria, preaching very different doctrines, so that the people hardly knew what to believe.|| In this state of things, reasons partly of a political nature, the existing differences with the Greek empire, and the closer connections which had been formed with the German empire, and partly religious, the uncertainty produced by the collision of the doctrines propagated among them, and the hope of receiving, as many other rude nations had done, a settled form of doctrine from the church of St. Peter, all these cir-

\* Constantin. Porphyrogenit. continuat. IV. c. 15. The more accurate accounts are drawn from the letter of pope Nicolaus I. to this prince, presently to be cited (c. 17).

† In the letter of Nicolaus, c. 14.

‡ L. c. c. 77. Graecorum quibusdam codicem accipientibus in manus clausum, unus ex iis accipiens parvissimam particulam ligni, hanc intra ipsum codicem condat, et si undecunque aliqua vertitur ambiguitas, per hoc affirmant scire se posse quod cupiunt.

\*§ L. c. c. 94.

|| L. c. c. 106. Multi ex diversis locis Christiani advenerint, qui prout voluntas eorum existit, multa et varia loquuntur, id est, Graeci, Armeni (perhaps Paulicians) et ex ceteris locis.

circumstances combined, induced the Bulgarian prince and his nobles, in the year 865, to apply for help to pope Nicholas I. This pope, in the following year, sent two Italian bishops,\* as his plenipotentiaries to Bulgaria, perhaps also with the proposal of appointing a bishop for that province.† He gave them Bibles, and other books suited to the wants of the new church, with a letter, in which he answered a hundred and six questions and petitions proposed to him by the Bulgarians. These answers show that it was not the sole anxiety of the pope to introduce among the Bulgarians the institutions of the Roman church, the papacy, and a Christian ceremonial; but that he was at great pains also to direct their attention to the things requisite for the advancement of the Christian life. And the respect which he paid to the peculiar situation and wants of the newly converted people, evinced his pastoral wisdom.

He told the Bulgarian prince and his nobles, and endeavoured to convince them of it by passages from the Bible, that they had sinned, in permitting the innocent to suffer with the guilty. And even with the guilty whom God had delivered into their hands, they ought to have pursued a more gentle course, sparing their lives, so as to give them an opportunity of voluntarily and cheerfully seeking forgiveness for what they had done.‡ With regard to those who would not renounce idolatry, he said, it should be attempted to bring them to the faith by exhortation and rational persuasions rather than by force. If they refused to listen, it was only necessary to avoid intercourse with them, thus they would become ashamed of their folly; but in no case should resort be had to violence to enforce belief, for nothing could be good which did not flow from free inclination of the will §. God required only a voluntary obedience; had it been his pleasure to use force, none could have resisted his almighty power. Such as refused to be converted, were reserved to the judgment of God. The

\* See Anastas. *Præfatio ad Concil. Constantiæop. IV. Harduin.* Concil. T. V. p. 757, respecting the Bulgarian prince idoneos institutores expetit et accepit, Paulum scilicet Populoniensem et Foxmostum Portu-

— *t At the close of his letter he speaks of the futurus episcopus.*

*† L. c. c. 17.*

*§ L. c. c. 41. Omne, quod ex voto non est, bonum esse non potest.*

## AGAINST SUPERSTITION.

pope obviously was too closely bound by the prejudices of his age, respecting the laws and rights of the church, to apply this principle in its full extent. He made a difference\* between unbelievers and those who fell away from the faith, though in reality the difference was only outward; yet to the latter, he applied the laws of the Old Testament against blasphemers. He sharply reproved the Bulgarians for their unjust and cruel conduct towards the above-mentioned Greek priest. He undertook his defence, on the ground that he had adopted that fiction from pious motives, and with the hope of saving many whose confidence he could not otherwise have gained; and even if he deserved to be punished, banishment from the country would have been sufficient in his case.† The pope was consulted respecting the bearing of the cross, which he explained,‡ as meaning the mortification of the flesh, or compassion to our neighbour; for it was our Lord's command that we should bear the cross in our hearts. But men ought also to bear it on their bodies, so as to be constantly reminded of their duty to bear it in the heart. In answer to the question on what festival days men ought to rest from bodily labour, he was not satisfied with barely naming the days, but took this opportunity to instruct the Bulgarians with regard to the design of festivals and of resting from labour on such days.§ Men, he said, were bound to rest from their labours on festival days, in order to have more leisure to attend church, to occupy themselves with prayer, with spiritual songs, and with the divine word, to imitate the example of the saints, and to distribute alms among the poor. But if a man neglected all these things, and squandered away in idle amusements the time taken from lawful occupations, he would do better to labour on such days with his own hands, that he might have something to bestow on the needy and suffering.

In connection with all these points, the pope was careful to warn the Bulgarians against a superstitious reliance on outward things, to which they were easily exposed, by reason of their previous pagan notions and habits. They had asked him what they were to do in times of war, in case of surprise by a sudden attack of the enemy, whilst they were assembled

\* L. c. c. 18.

‡ L. c. c. 7.

† L. c. c. 14—17.

§ L. c. c. 11.

#### AGAINST CRUEL PUNISHMENTS.

in the church for prayer, which would leave them no opportunity to finish their devotions. He told them that the devotions thus commenced might be finished in any other place; for Christians were not confined to any particular place of prayer, like the ancient Jews to Jerusalem.\* They had asked him, whether they might be allowed to go out on any day to battle; to which he replied,† that in the pursuit of their lawful business, men were not restricted to particular days, save only (sudden emergencies excepted) the festivals he had mentioned, which were reverenced by all Christians;—not as though it were wrong to do things lawful even on those days; for men should not rest their hopes on particular times and seasons, or expect to derive help from them, but only on the living God. Rather, on these festivals they should be more diligent in prayer, except prevented by some unavoidable necessity. So, in answer to a like question respecting the times for fasting he said:‡ All wars and contentions came from the temptations of the great adversary; hence they should, if possible, be avoided, not only in times of fasting, but always. But in cases of necessity, when men are called upon to prepare for war, in defence of their country or of its laws, it would, doubtless, be improper to lay aside these preparations, even in times of fasting; for to do so would be tempting God, by neglecting to do all that lies in our power, for our own good and that of others, or for preventing any injury which might be done to religion. Having explained to them,§ that with the baptismal vow they renounced all arts of divination and sorcery, and all that superstitious observance of days and hours, to which they had formerly been accustomed to resort, in preparing for war, he wrote them, that the preparation for fighting a battle on the side of religion should consist in repairing to the church, offering up prayer, celebrating the mass, forgiving those who had injured them, opening the prisons and setting the prisoners free, restoring freedom to the slaves, especially to the sick and the feeble, and distributing alms to the needy. The pope, it is true, carefully avoided intermeddling with the civil legislation of the country; but he took every opportunity to re-

\* L. c. c. 74.

† L. c. c. 45.

‡ L. c. c. 34.

§ L. c. c. 35.

monstrate against the barbarous severity which prevailed in the existing code of laws. He objected to the frequent employment of the punishment of death, recommending the greater mildness which Christianity enjoins.\* Far be it—says he to them in this connection—that after having come to the knowledge of so merciful a God and Saviour, they should still proceed to indulge in the same severity as before in the administration of justice. Rather ought they now to be as much inclined to preserve the lives of others, as they had formerly been to take them. “As the apostle Paul, who once breathed threatening and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord, was ready, after he had obtained mercy, to be banished or to give up his life for his brethren, so should they also, after having been called by God’s election, and illuminated by his light, not only no longer thirst, as before, after the shedding of blood, but seek, on every occasion, to restore life to all, and as well the life of the body as that of the soul. And since Christ has restored you from eternal death to eternal life, so ought you to seek to deliver from the ruin of death not only the innocent but the guilty.” The pope earnestly protested against the employment of the rack, which was commonly resorted to by the Bulgarians, for the conviction of such as were accused of theft.† This mode of procedure, he writes to them, is against all law, both human and divine. “And suppose you fail, by all the tortures you employ, to extort from the accused a confession of guilt, must you not then, at least, feel ashamed of yourselves, and perceive the godless manner in which you administer justice? Again; suppose a man forced by torture to confess himself guilty of a crime which he never committed, will not the guilt fall on the one who compelled him to make the false confession? Detest then, with your whole heart, that which you have hitherto been accustomed to do in your ignorance.” He exhorted them to be just and gentle in the treatment of their slaves, and to keep constantly before their minds those passages of the New Testament, which taught them that they had one and the same Master in heaven, Col. iv. and Ephes. iv.‡ The

\* L. c. c. 25.

† L. c. c. 86: quod judex caput ejus verberibus tundat et aliis stimulis ferriis, dovece veritatem spromat, ipsius latera pungat.

‡ L. c. c. 210

### THE POPE'S PRUDENCE.

people had been asked how it was proper to treat freemen, apprehended in the act of fleeing from their country.\* To this he answered, first, that they should treat them according to the existing laws. But he added, that many holy men, as Abraham, had left their native country, without being considered, for this reason alone, as having done anything criminal. He who cannot be allowed to leave his country is not a free man. It was a custom among the Bulgarians, in the spirit of oriental despotism, to allow no person to sit and eat at the same table with the king, not even his own wife; while his nobles were obliged to sit at a distance, on separate stools, and eat from the ground. The pope having been requested to give his commands, with respect to the observance of this custom, replied, that although this practice must be considered a violation of good manners, yet as it stood in no direct contradiction to right faith, he had no commands to give on the subject; he only exhorted and advised them to follow the example of Christian princes, and dismiss all idle and arrogant pretensions. Christian princes, he said, paid respect to the words of our Lord in the Gospel, Learn of me, for I am meek and lowly of heart. Ancient kings, many of whom were deemed worthy of holding communion with the saints, ate with their friends, nay even with their servants. Nay, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, the Saviour, ate not only with his servants and friends, the apostles, but also with publicans and sinners.†

Though in other respects the pope endeavoured, by the spirit of Christianity, to infuse a better influence into the social institutions of this rude people, yet he knew how to keep distinct and separate from each other the principles of civil, and of religious, ecclesiastical legislation. He recognized the freedom which should be enjoyed by every nation within the pale of Christianity to shape and fashion its laws and social institutions, according to its own individuality of character, subject only to the demands of Christianity. Although many opportunities were offered him, by the questions which the Bulgarians proposed, to determine matters pertaining to secular relations, yet he never availed himself of them, unless led to do so by the immediate interests of Christianity.

\* L. c. c. 20.

† L. c. c. 42.

When asked,\* for example, whether they ought, as before, to give gold, silver, oxen, horses, etc., as dowries to their wives, he answered: that they might be allowed not only to do this, but everything else not sinful, which it had been their custom to do before their baptism. Peter had been a fisherman, and Matthew a toll-gatherer; after they were converted, Peter returned to his nets, but Matthew did not return to his former employment as a toll-gatherer. And as they asked him about the propriety of their dress, he said:† "We require no alteration of your outward garb, but only the change of your inward man; that ye put on Christ; as the apostle says of all who have been baptized into Christ, that they have put on Christ. We inquire about nothing, except whether ye increase in faith and in good works." The cautious prudence of the pope, on all matters of this sort, is shown by his answer when solicited to give them a collection of civil laws. He said that he would be very glad to send them such books as might serve their purpose in this respect for the present, were he sure that there were any among them who would be able to interpret and expound them.‡ And, for this reason, his delegates were charged not to leave behind them any of the books of this description, which they had taken along with them, lest mischievous consequences might arise, either from wrong interpretations or from falsifications of the text.

On another point, however, the pope was prevented, by his church prejudices, or his misunderstanding of the Scriptures, from attempting to conciliate the spontaneous feelings of nature with those of the Christian. The Bulgarians had inquired of him concerning the fate of their ancestors, who had died without the faith. He answered,§ that for them they ought not to pray; adducing in proof the passage in 1 John, v. 16, respecting the sin which is unto death. Moreover, as the interest which he took in his idea of the papacy actuated him no less than his interest for the spread of Christianity—the two being inseparably connected together in his mind—he could not forbear inculcating it on the prince as an important principle, that though it would be necessary to appoint bishops over the new church, yet these should be held bound, in all

\* L. c. c. 49.

† L. c. c. 59.

‡ L. c. c. 13.

L. c. c. 88.

dubious and weighty concerns, to ask council of the apostolic chair.\*

From these transactions of pope Nicholas with the Bulgarians, it must appear quite evident, that he was far better qualified to provide for their religious wants, than a Greek patriarch had proved to be. Yet the Bulgarians still continued to waver, according to the sway of their political interests, between the Greek and the Latin church, till finally they decided once more wholly in favour of the first. The Greek emperor, Basilius the Macedonian, spared neither pains nor expense, to bring about this result; and at length it was so arranged, that a Greek archbishop, and Greek bishop, chosen from among the monks, were admitted into the country, and set over the Bulgarian church.†

The conversion of the tribes bordering on the Greek empire was brought about chiefly through the exertions of two men from Constantinople, Constantine a monk,‡ called a Philosopher, or, according to his ecclesiastical name, Cyril, and his brother Methodius; the latter being probably the same person, whom we have already noticed in connection with Bulgaria.§

\* Semper in rebus dubiis et negotiis majoribus sedem totius ecclesiae more consulent apostolicam.

† Constantin. Porphyrogenit. Life of Macedo, considering the subject from the standing-point of the system of doctrine taught in the Greek church, represents the matter as if the Bulgarians were now, for the first time, rightly instructed in Christianity. See § 95.

‡ Anastasius, in his preface to the fourth general council of Constantinople, notices him as a friend of the learned Photius, and a zealous defender of church orthodoxy: Constantinus philosophus magnae sanctitatis vir. Harduin. Concil. T. V. p. 752. The title "philosopher" was given to him either on account of his learned education, or of his distinguished eminence as a monk.

§ It is to be lamented, that the accounts we have of these two remarkable men are so meagre and unauthentic. The oldest, in the *Actis sanct.* f. 19, at the 9th of March.

Some time after this section was printed, I succeeded in obtaining, through the particular kindness of H. Kopitar, of Vienna, a copy of a rare work, of which I would have been glad to avail myself before—the Greek biography of Clement, archbishop of Bulgaria, composed by his scholar the archbishop Theophylact, and published from a manuscript belonging to the monastery of St. Maum, in Macedonia, *παντοποιίᾳ Αὐτοσινού λεοντάκου τοῦ Παμπάτσου*, together with a tract by Nicephorus Callistus, *αεβ'* (1802). Though this biography is an authority of no great weight, in what it reports concerning the fortunes of Cyril and Methodius, and the history of the Moravian church, yet the accounts it

When the Chazars, a powerful tribe, who inhabited the peninsula of Crimea, where Jews and Mohammedans were seeking to make proselytes, sent an embassy to the Greek emperor Michael, requesting him to provide for them a teacher of Christianity, the abovementioned Cyril was despatched on this mission. A part of the people embraced Christianity; yet, as late as the tenth century, they were still divided between pagans, who constituted the minority, and Mohammedans, Jews, and Christians.\*

contains respecting the labours of Clement in Bulgaria, bear marks of special accuracy and truth. We are enabled by means of them, to form a nearer acquaintance with those missionaries, who did so much for the instruction and culture of a rude people; and the spirit of Methodius is seen in his school, in a very advantageous point of light. We could wish that, in some one of the Slavonian languages, sources may yet be found to furnish still more contributions to the history of this remarkable man. It is said here, that when Clement, with other scholars of Methodius, were driven, after his death, through the influence of the Latin and German party, out of Moravia, they repaired to Bulgaria, and were received by the prince Bogoris (Bogor, as he is here called), with the greater joy, because this country stood in great need of teachers. The author of this writing, who represents himself as a Bulgarian, describes, with enthusiastic love for his teacher Clement, the zealous activity of the latter in everything which could advance the improvement of the people and the country. He had chosen out for himself a band of three thousand five hundred young men, on whose Christian instruction he bestowed his particular attention, and from among whom he endeavoured to train up teachers for the rest. He took pains to instruct the very children in reading and writing, and to make them understand what they read. He was never idle—says his biographer—sometimes he undertook to do two things at once—he wrote, and at the same time taught the children. As the Bulgarian priests were too ignorant to instruct the people by preaching, as they had no homilies written in their own language, and could not understand Greek, he composed in the Bulgarian tongue a series of simple discourses, adapted to the condition of the rude people, for all the festivals of the year (Δόγματα οιους μὴ διαφέρεται μὴ δι την ἡλικίατας τον Βουλγάρων). As no trees or herbs were to be found in Bulgaria, save the wild growth of the forests and the fields, to supply this deficiency, he procured from the Greek empire fruit-trees of every sort, and improved the wild trees by grafting. To excite a taste among the Bulgarians for the arts of cultivated life, he caused beautiful churches to be built, and sought by this means also to chain their affections to the house and worship of God. First a monastery was founded in the city of Achrida, the principal seat of his labours; then an episcopal residence was erected for him at Drembrizza, or Belitza, the first determinate episcopal see in this country. He died in the year 6424, according to the Byzantine era of the world, therefore in the year 916.

\* So relates Ahmed II in Foszlan, who travelled as an ambassador of the

Cyrill, who was afterwards assisted by his brother Methodius, extended the sphere of his labours from this people to other pagan tribes.

The Slavonian nation of the Moravians had been made subject to the Frankish empire by Charlemagne; and by this connection, Christianity found its way to many parts of the tribe. The active sphere of Arno, archbishop of Salzburg, to whom Charlemagne had given the direction of a mission among these Slavonian tribes,\* as also of his successors, had been extended to these parts; and the newly-founded churches in the present provinces of Carinthia, Steiermark, and Hungary, were reckoned as belonging partly to the see of Salzburg, partly to that of the archbishops of Lorch. Thus the princes Moymar and Privinna, who stood in connection with the German empire, appear under the character of Christian princes. The latter of these resided at Mosburg on the lake of Platten (supposed to be the modern Salawar), and had founded in that place a Christian church.† But the Moravian nation, as a whole, was still devoted to paganism; and its ruler, Radislav or Rastices, formed an alliance, from motives of political interest, with the Greek empire. This furnished the occasion on account of which the two brothers, already mentioned, came to be sent to him as teachers of Christianity. That which distinguishes Cyril from all the other missionaries of this period is the fact, that he did not yield to the prejudice, which represented the languages of the rude nations as too profane to be employed for sacred uses, nor shrink from any toil which was necessary in order to become accurately acquainted with the language of the people among whom he laboured. Accordingly he resided for a long time at Chersonesus in order to learn the language of the Chazars;‡ and in like manner he mastered the Slavonian-tongue, when he was called to teach among Slavonian nations. On this occasion he invented for it an alphabet, and translated

caliphs through their country, in the year 921. Their king, at that time, was a Jew. See the Essay of Frähn, in the Mémoires de l'Académie de St. Petersbourg, Tom. VII. 1820, p. 590.

\* See Vol. III. p. 87.

† See the narrative of a Salzburgian priest of the year 873. De Conversione Bajoariorum et Carenthanorum, in Freher's Scriptores rerum Boemicarum, f. 19.

‡ See the oldest report in the Actis sanct. s. 2.

the Holy Scriptures into the language. He also made use of it for liturgical purposes:—so much greater interest did he feel in enabling the people to appropriate Christianity with a clear sense of its import, than to introduce among them a bare ceremonial. But when afterwards it so happened, that the Moravian prince, induced by political changes, entered into a closer connection with the German empire and the Western church, this step, taken at a time when the schism between the Greek and Latin churches first broke out, was naturally followed by an entanglement of ecclesiastical relations. Cyril and Methodius proved themselves to be men who placed a higher value on the interests of Christianity than on those of a particular church. They repaired to Rome, where they found no difficulty in entering into an understanding with pope Hadrian I. Cyril resigned his office, and remained at Rome as a monk.\* But Methodius, after having testified his submission to the Romish church, and laid down an oral as well as a written confession of faith, which satisfied the pope, was consecrated by the latter archbishop of the Moravian church.† At a later period, however, the activity of Methodius seems to have been interrupted or checked by political disturbances in the Moravian kingdom,—its wars with the

\* This part of the history, as well as the first negotiations of Cyril and Methodius with the pope, is enveloped in great obscurity. According to the later legends, though the earliest of the above cited narratives says nothing of the kind, Cyril was summoned to Rome by pope Nicolaus, to give an account of himself for using the Slavonian tongue in the liturgical services. But it is said he did not arrive at Rome until after the death of Nicholas in 868, when he removed all scruples respecting this use of the Slavonian tongue from the mind of his successor, pope Hadrian. But these accounts cannot be correct; for it is plain from the letter of pope John VII. to Methodius, that no negotiations had as yet been held on this subject; and as in the letters written by this pope to Moravia, the same remarks, and often expressed in the same language, occur, as those said to have been orally made by Cyril to pope Hadrian, it may be conjectured, that Cyril's discourse was made up out of these remarks of the pope. This was already perceived by Asseman, *Kalendaria ecclesiæ universæ*, Tom. III. p. 175, and by Dobrowsky in his *historico-critical Essay on Cyril and Methodius*, Prague, 1823, p. 71. But it is manifest from this circumstance, how uncertain the later narratives must be, which are connected with this part of church history.

† This may be gathered from the words of pope John to Methodius, ep. 96: *sicut verbis et literis te sanctæ Romanae ecclesiæ credere promisiſti. Harduin. Consil. T. VI. P. I. p. 61.*

German empire, the occurrences subsequent to the capture of Radislav, and the chequered fortunes of his successor Zwentibald or Swatopluk, in 870 and the following years. Whether it was, that the disturbances in Moravia induced him to take refuge in the adjacent Christian provinces connected with the German empire, over which Chozil, the son of Pravinna, ruled; or that he extended the circle of his labours to these districts; suffice it to say, that his appearance in this field where Salzburgian priests were labouring, aroused the jealousy and suspicion of the German clergy. His attachment to the customs of the Greek church, his holding divine service in the Slavonian tongue, and the peculiar form in which he caused the creed to be chanted, with regard to the process of the Holy Spirit, all this would appear strange and foreign to the German ecclesiastics;\* while the celebration of divine worship in the Slavonian tongue, which was understood by the people, would naturally be more edifying to the people than the same held in the to themu nintelligible Latin language. This displeased the German clergy, who forfeited their good standing with the people, and the Salzburgian arch-priest who presided over the ecclesiastical institutions in this district, withdrew for this reason to Salzburg.†

Thus complaints on the part of the German clergy against

\* The aversion felt towards Methodius betrays itself in the report of the above mentioned contemporary priests, in the narrative of the Salzburgian priest, *De conversione Bojor. et Carinth.* where he speaks of Methodius' arrival within the province of prince Chozil, and says that the archpriest Richbald, who had been sent there by the archbishop of Salzburg was induced by that circumstance to return home again. "Qui multum tempus ibi demoratus est, exercens suum potestative officium, sicut illi injunxit archepiscopus suus, usquedam quidam Graecus Methodius nomine noviter inventis Slavinis literis linguam Latinam doctrinamque Romanam atque literas auctorabiles latinas philosophice superducens." That is, Methodius despises the Latin language and doctrine as a philosopher,—just as complaints were afterwards made about the *nova doctrina Methodii philosophi*. The name philosopher is certainly not applied to him here as an encomium; but to denote that he was unchurchlike. But this name, Methodius may have brought with him from his country, as his brother Constantine or Cyril had done. See the continuation of the Latin words in the following note.

† The remarkable words of the above mentioned priest, who related this, when it had just taken place: "vilescere fecit cuncto populo ex parte missas et evangelia ecclesiasticumque officium illorum, qui hoc latine celebraverunt quod ille ferre non volens, sedem repetit Jyavensem."

the archbishop Methodius, reached the ear of Pope John VIII. He was accused of having infringed on the see of the archbishop of Salzburg ; he was reproached with employing a different language from that of the church in divine worship, and doubtless also with the attachment which he showed to the Greek church, and with his deviations from the Romish in many other particulars. Though the pope was disposed to protect an archbishop ordained at Rome in his dignity and his rights, where he was dependent only on the pope himself, and not to give him up as a victim to the German bishops ; yet by these accusations, his mind was filled with misgivings, as might naturally be expected, especially at that period of constant bickerings between the Latin and the Greek church.\* For these reasons, he summoned the archbishop Methodius to Rome, at the same time forbidding him to hold mass in any other than the Greek or the Latin language, according to the universal practice of the churches scattered among the different nations. Yet he was allowed to preach in the language of the country, because in the 117th Psalm all the people are called upon to praise God, and the Apostle Paul, 1<sup>st</sup> Philip. ii. 11, says every tongue shall confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father. Methodius obeyed the call, and in the year 879 repaired to Rome, accompanied by an ambassador of the Moravian prince Swatopluk and by a certain Wichin, whom that prince wished to have ordained as bishop of Neutra. Methodius succeeded in coming to an understanding with the pope on all the contested points. He was completely satisfied with the explanation of his doctrinal views, and allowed him to retain his accustomed form of

\* The pope was informed, that the Moravians had fallen into doubts respecting the true faith ; and he exhorts them (see the letter ad Tuventarum de Marauna, ep. 89) to adhere firmly in all things to the faith of the Romish church. We may doubtless infer from this, that a suspicion had entered the mind of the pope that the Moravians were inclined to favour the doctrine of the Greek church. He says, in fact, concerning Methodius, quia aliter docet, quam coram sede apostolica se credere verius et literis professus est, valde miramur. This prince Tuventar must have belonged to a Slavonian tribe converted long before this time ; for the pope speaks as if his ancestors had received the Christian doctrine ~~from~~ the preceding popes. Dobrowsky in his work, Moravian legends concerning Cyril and Methodius, Prague, 1826, p. 60, expresses the conjecture that Maranna was the city Morawa, situated near the extreme limits of Pannonia.

† Ecclesia Nitrensis.

expressing the creed in respect<sup>1</sup> to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit.<sup>2</sup> Methodius succeeded in "convincing the pope also that the use which he had hitherto made of the Slavonian language in divine worship was in no respect reprehensible, but altogether conducive to the edification of the people. The pope even stood forth as his defender on this point, and wrote as follows to the Moravian prince :† "The alphabet invented by a certain philosopher Constantine,‡ to the end that God's praise may duly sound forth in it, we rightly command; and we order that in this language the messages and works of our Lord Christ be declared; for we are exhorted by Holy Scripture to praise the Lord, not in three languages alone, but in all tongues and nations, Ps. cxvii. and Philip. ii. And the apostles, full of the Holy Ghost, proclaimed in all languages the great works of God. And the apostle Paul exhorts us, 1 Cor. xiv., that speaking in tongues<sup>3</sup> we should edify the church. It stands not at all in contradiction with the faith, to celebrate the mass in this language, to read the gospel or lessons from the Scripture<sup>4</sup> properly translated into it, or to rehearse any of the church hymns in the same (aut alia horarum officia omnia psallere); for the God who is

\* It is clear, that this had been a subject of controversy. The pope says of it in his letter to the Moravian princes, ep. 107: "Igitur hunc Methodium venerabilem archeepiscopum vestrum interrogavimus eorum positis fratribus nostris episcopis, si orthodoxae fidei symbolum ita crederet et inter sacra missarum solennia caneret, sicut sanctam Romanam ecclesiam tenere et in sanctis sex universalibus synodus a sanctis patribus secundum evangelicam Christi Dei nostri auctoritatem promulgatum est atque traditum constat. Ille autem professus est, in justa evangelicam et apostolicam doctrinam sicuti sancta Romana ecclesia docet et a patribus traditum est, tenere et psallere." This has reference to the retaining of the creed in the unaltered ancient form which was conformable to the evangelica Christi auctoritas, the words of Christ, John 15, 26. See more on this point under the history of controversies.

† Ep. 107.

‡ This expression deserves notice: "literas a Constantino quodam philosopho repertas." Thus it is customary to speak of a man, of whom little is known. How is it conceivable that, if the pope knew this Constantine to be the brother of Methodius, if this Constantine had been in the office of his predecessors recognized by the pope, if he had died as a monk at Rome, the pope should have so expressed himself concerning him? especially since it must have been pleasing to him to recommend the alphabet particularly on account of its inventor, a holy monk, a man who had died in true submission to St. Peter's church at Rome, the founder of the Moravian church.

the author of the three principal languages, created the others also for his own glory. Only it is necessary, in order to greater solemnity, that in all the Moravian churches the gospel should in the first place be publicly read in Latin, and then repeated in the Slavonian language, so as to be understood by the people."\*

The pope consecrated the before-named Wichin bishop of Neitra, and directed that, at some future time, another priest or deacon of the Moravians should be sent to him for the purpose of being ordained to the episcopal office: so that the archbishop, together with these two suffragan bishops, could afterwards, according to the ancient rule, consecrate such bishops as might be needed for the new church. In 880, Methodius returned home to his diocese. The pope recommended him, in emphatic terms, to his sovereign, whose prejudices no doubt had already been excited against him. The pope also confirmed him as independent archbishop of the new church, responsible to no other person than himself for his administration of that church,† which was doubtless intended to shield him against the attacks he had to endure from the German prelates.

But Methodius could not fail to be involved, on his return, in new disputes with the German bishops and clergy; for these latter would not consent that the Moravians, who had been dependent on the German empire and on the German church, and received the first seeds of Christianity from German bishops, should now form an independent church under their own archbishop, and that a district should be withdrawn from the diocese of a German prelate which had once belonged to it.‡ Added to this, was the particular aversion

\* To this the pope adds: "et si tibi et judicibus tuis placet missas Latina Lingua magis audire, præcipimus, ut Latine missarum tibi solemnia celebrentur." Perhaps the solemnity of the mass, when celebrated in a sacred language, had been more agreeable to the Moravian princes.

† Nam populus Domini illi commissus est et pro animabus eorum hic redditurus est rationem.

‡ This mode of viewing the matter is presented in the complaints, which Theotmar, archbishop of Salzburg, with his suffragans, offered in the year 900 to pope John IX. Harduin. Concil. T. VI. P. I. p. 126. Terra Slavonorum, quis Moravi dicuntur, quæ regibus nostris et populu nostro, nobis quoque cum habitatoribus suis subacta fuerat tam in cultu

## METHODIUS DISAGREES WITH SWATOPLUK.

of the Germans to an archbishop coming from the Greek church, and their blind fanatical zeal against the peculiarities of that church, after the antagonism between the two churches\* had once become publicly expressed. Before this time, the German clergy seemed to have acquired some influence over the Moravian prince, which influence was now increased by the change of political relations, the close alliance of Swatopluk with duke Arnolph of Carinthia, afterwards emperor. Hence arose more serious misunderstandings between Methodius and his sovereign.† The bishop Wichin, who should

Christianæ religionis, quam in tributo substantiæ secularis, quia exinde primum imbuti et ex paganis Christiani sunt facti. Archbishop Methodius is passed over in silence in this letter, as if no such man had ever existed, and only the bishop Wichin, ordained at Rome, is mentioned, and he as one who had been ordained for a country then for the first time subdued by the Moravian princes, and then for the first time made acquainted with Christianity by means of the Moravians (a country therefore whose case was quite different from that of the Moravians, who had before this been converted by missionaries from Germany). By the appointment of this bishop, the interests of the German church were not endangered.

\* See on a future page.

† The old legends, which speak of the misunderstanding between the two, of the excommunication which Methodius pronounced on the prince, of his journey to Rome and his recall, deserve but little credence, owing to their character in other respects, and particularly on account of the want of all connection in the narratives. Besides the cause of the misunderstanding is still left in uncertainty. But by comparing the documents already cited, and the consolatory letter of the pope to Methodius, presently to be mentioned, and by considering the fact that Methodius soon disappears from the page of history, we may come to some clear conclusion with regard to the truth which lies at the bottom of these accounts. In the narrative, not now before me, of the life of the Bulgarian archbishop Clement, said to have been a disciple of Methodius, written at a much later period, from which a fragment was first published by Leo Allatius, and which was published complete at Vienna in 1802, the true cause of the quarrel is correctly stated by a zealous adherent of the Greek church, as having been the aversion of the German clergy to that church. See the passages drawn from this writing by Dobrowsky, in the essay already referred to, *Cyrill and Methodius*, p. 115.

According to the account in the above cited biography of Clement, Methodius died in Moravia, having administered the archiepiscopal office 24 years; and it was not until after his death, that the Frankish or German party obtained the ascendancy, and induced Swatopluk to persecute those who adhered to the doctrine of the Greek church. Methodius had fixed upon one of his scholars, Gorasd, a Moravian acquainted with the Greek as well as the Slavonian language, for his successor; but this person was supplanted by bishop Wichin (*Bryvines*), with whom

have acted as his subordinate, attached himself to the German party, and appeared as his opponent. It should seem, that he affected the air of one who had been directed by the pope to keep a watch over Methodius and see that he remained true to the principles of the Latin church, attempting to do nothing in contradiction to them. And he seems to have taken advantage of this, to injure the archbishop in various ways.\* Even Swatopluk appealed to a letter of the pope; whether it was, that he misconstrued the language of the letter above cited, or that he pretended to have received another. Methodius had many difficulties to encounter;† and when his adversaries appealed to those plenary powers which they had received from the pope, he began doubtless to feel perplexed about this. He reported to the pope the whole matter; and begged for permission to appear himself once more in his presence. John VIII. granted him his request; and was desirous, at the same time, of hearing both sides. Meantime, he endeavoured to assure him, by a friendly letter,‡ of the sincerity of his intentions towards him;§ and exhorted him to persevere in prosecuting the work which he had begun, in the confidence that, if God was for him, no man could prevail against him. Methodius availed himself of the permission given him by the pope. In 881, he went to Rome, and from that time he disappears from the records of history; whether it was, that he soon after died, or that the party so hostile to

Methodius himself had many contests, and who stood at the head of the German party. The scholars of Methodius, among whom Gorasd, Clement, Nauin, Angelarius, and Sabbas, are mentioned as the most distinguished, were expelled the country. The author of this writing complains of the ill-treatment which they suffered from the German soldiers: *Νιγροί* (Slavonian name for the Germans) φοβούται ανίμαγος ἵχοντες.

We infer this from the fact that the pope, in his letter to Methodius, deemed it necessary to assure him, that he had never given any such commission to that bishop (who certainly can be no other than the Wichin also named in the Life of archbishop Clement), nor bound him by oath to any supervision of that nature. *Neque episcopo illi palam vel secreto aliud faciendum injunximus et aliud a te peragendum decrevimus, quanto manus credendum est, ut sacramentum ab eodem episcopo exegerimus, quem saltem levi sermone super hoc negotio allocuti non suimus.*

\* As the pope says in his letter, "Quidquid enormiter adversus te est commissum, quidquid jam dictus episcopus contra suum ministerium in te exercuit." † Ep. 268. Mansi Concil. T. XVI. f. 199.

§ "Ideo gese; ista dubietas," he writes to him.

him in Moravia did not permit him again to enter his field of labour in that country. The German bishops continued, still to oppose the founding of an independent Moravian archbishopric,\* till the Moravian kingdom was dissolved, and became a prey to the Germans, Hungarians, and Bohemians. \*

By occasion of the political dependence of Bohemia on the Moravian kingdom, at the time when Methodius was labouring in the latter country, duke Borziwoi of Bohemia became acquainted with Christianity at the court of his liege-lord, and was baptized.† For a long time, however, the contest was maintained between Christianity and paganism in the afterwards independent kingdom of Bohemia. Borziwoi's son, duke Wratislav, left behind him, at his death in 925, two minor sons, the elder named Wenceslav, and a younger Boleslav. The care of their education was entrusted to their

\* See the above mentioned letter of the archbishop of Salzburg to pope John IX., and the letter, written in the like spirit, of Hatto, archbishop of Mentz, and his suffragan bishops, to the same pope. Illi autem Moraviam in occasionem superbicie assumunt, q[ui]a a vestra concessione dicunt se metropolitanum suspicere et singulariter degentes aliorum episcoporum consortia refutant. Mansi Concil. T. XVIII. f. 205.

† Dean Cosmo, of Prague, in his Bohemian Chronicles, makes mention of the baptism of Borziwoi in the year 994. Were this date correct, then, according to what we have above remarked respecting the life of Methodius, no immediate share can be assigned to him in the conversion of Borziwoi. Dobrowsky, the learned investigator of the history of the Slavonian church, thought he must put the conversion of Borziwoi between the years 870 and 880; see his Moraviae Legends of Cyril and Methodius, p. 114. The contested Moravian-Bohemian legends relate that when Borziwoi betook himself to the court of his feudal lord, and, as a heathen, could not eat at the same table with him, but must eat with his own people, sitting upon the ground, Methodius testified sympathy for him, and improved the opportunity to direct his attention to what he would gain for this temporal life, as well as for the eternal, by the reception of Christianity. Moreover, what is here said of the relation of the vassal to his superior, is at least consistent with Slavonian customs. See above, p. 433.

What is said of the relation of Drahomira to Ludmilla, needed a more careful examination. The Russian legend, considered by those who are versed in the Slavonian literature, as very ancient, and published by M. Wostokow, of St. Petersburg, from a manuscript of the fifteenth century, represents the relation of Drahomira to Christianity in a far more favourable point of light. When I wrote what is found in the text, I could not avail myself of this legend, which has since been made known to me, in a translation, by a special kindness of a learned scholar in the Slavonian literature.

grandmother Ludmilla, a devoted Christian, and she was at the head of the Christian party. Their mother, on the other hand, Drabomira or Dragomir, who became mistress of the kingdom, was devoted with a blind zeal to paganism, and doubtless feared also lest Ludmilla's influence might endanger her power. She procured her assassination. In the meantime, Wenceslav had received into a susceptible mind the seeds of Christian piety imparted to him by his grandmother. The ardour of his Christian zeal, however, was marred by one defect. He had not been so educated and disciplined as to qualify him for acting to the greatest advantage as a sovereign, for the advancement of God's kingdom; but had received such training and direction as belonged rather, at that time, to the profession of a clergyman or a monk. On coming to the government, he exerted himself not only to suppress idolatry and to destroy its monuments, but also to introduce Christian discipline and a reformation of morals among his people, as well as to soften the rudeness of their manners. He abolished the frequent and cruel punishments of death, and founded monasteries, churches, and benevolent institutions.\*

Already, as it is said, he was on the eve of abdicating the sovereign authority, becoming a monk, and making a pilgrimage to Rome, when, at the instigation of his brother, Boleslav, a man fanatically devoted to paganism, he was murdered in the year 938. With the accession of this prince, surnamed the Cruel, paganism again revived. Yet, by a treaty of peace, into which Boleslav was forced by his conqueror, the emperor Otho I., in the year 950, he was obliged to promise the restoration of the churches, and the re-establishment of the priests. He himself seems to have undergone some change of mind, under the suffering of his later reverses, and, from sincere conviction, to have professed Christianity at a later period. The foundation of the Bohemian church was completed by his son and successor, Boleslav the Mild, under whose reign this church was established with a fixed central point, in the archbishopric of Prague. Yet, for a long time, pagan barbarism maintained its sway in Bohemia, under the garb of Christianity.†

\* See Memoir of his life by the monk Christian, in Balbini epitome hist. rerum Bohemicarum, f. 54.

† The biographer of Archbishop Adalbert of Prague says of the Bohe-

Fierce and violent were the contests which Adalbert, a man sprung from a noble family of that land, and educated at Magdeburg, had to sustain, when, in 983, he became archbishop of Prague, and, impatient of the hitherto prevailing outbreaks of barbarism, endeavoured to compel submission from the people to all the ordinances of the church. He combated, in particular, polygamy, the concubinage of the clergy, and the traffic in Christian slaves carried on by the Jews.\* Had Adalbert been more free from fanatical extravagances, and had he failed less in point of Christian prudence and coolness, he would, no doubt, have been able to accomplish more than he did. He aspired to the death of a martyr. After having twice fled to Rome from the rude people who would not listen to his voice, and retired to the monastic life, and twice returned home to his see at the pope's command, and after having abandoned it again for the third time, in following his restless impulse to labour and suffer for the faith, he met the death he desired in 997, among the Prussians. It was not till the year 1038 that Severus, archbishop of Prague, succeeded, under more favourable circumstances, to enforce the ecclesiastical laws respecting the contract and sacred observance of a Christian marriage, the keeping of festival days, and similar matters, to the promulgation of which he pretended to have been called in a vision, by the martyr Adalbert himself.† The use of the Slavonian language in divine worship, which had been derived by this church from the Moravians, and prevailed in scattered instances, was also fiercely opposed, and looked upon by many as heretical.‡

From the times of Charlemagne various attempts had been made to reduce certain populous tribes of Slavonian origin, bearing the name of Wends, and dwelling on the northern and eastern borders of Germany, between the Elbe, Oder, and Saale, to the Frankish empire, and bring them over to the Romish church. But that Christianity which had been imposed on them by constraint, and with the loss of their liberties

mians (see *Acta sanctor. April. T. II. f. 179*): "Plerique nomine ~~tenus~~ Christiani ritu gentilium vivunt."

\* *I. 2. f. 181.*

† See the *Chronicle of Cosmas*, book II.

‡ See an example in the appendix to the *Chronicle of Cosmas*. See *Menken Script. rerum Germanicarum. T. III. f. 1786.*

independent individuality as a nation, became odious to them. The devastating irruptions of the Normans, of which we have spoken on a former page, contributed to the revival of paganism in these districts. Too little pains had been bestowed on the business of giving religious instruction to this people, in a form adapted to their national peculiarities. Though individual bishops, to whose dioceses many people from these tribes belonged, laboured zealously for their conversion, yet there was a want of teachers for them, sufficiently well acquainted with the Slavonian tongue. And though it is evident that individual bishops and monks,\* led on by their pious zeal, did really acquire a knowledge of the Slavonian, yet the number was too small, compared with the great mass of the people who were to be converted. Had the example of Cyril and Methodius found more imitators, the planting of the Christian church among those populations would have been greatly facilitated. How great a hindrance was presented by the foreign liturgical language appears, among others, from the following example:—Among the persons zealously engaged in labouring for the conversion of the Slavonians belonged, in the last half of the tenth century, a certain Boso, who resided first as a monk in the abbey of St. Emmeran, at Regensburg, and was then employed as a clergyman in the service of the emperor Otho I. He learnt the Slavonian language, preached in it, converted and baptized many Slavonians; and the emperor rewarded his labours by making him the first bishop over the see of Mersburg, founded by him for the Slavonians. He now wrote off for them the liturgical forms in Slavonian characters;† but in spite of all his pains to get them to sing the Kyrie Eleison, he could not succeed. They transformed the phrase into a combination of Slavonian words, with a somewhat similar sound, Kyrkjolsa, and amused them-

¶ Helmold, a parish priest belonging to the village Bosow, in the bishopric of Lubeck, who in the twelfth century wrote a history of the conversion of the Slavonians, cites (I. I. c. VI. of his *Chronica Slavorum*) an old tradition, which states that in the reign of the emperor Lewis II. monks from the monastery of Corvey—stimulated, perhaps, by the example of Anschar—had gone forth as missionaries among these Slavonian tribes.

\* Hic ut sibi commisso eo facilius instrueret, Slavonica scipserat verba. *Ditmar Menseberg Chronica I. II. f. 24. ed. Raineccii. Francof. 1580.* But the whole passage is more complete in the edition in *Leibniz Script. rerum Brunsvic. T. I.*

selves with the thought that he wanted to have them sing "the alder stands in the hedge." It is a just remark, that a very different impression would, doubtless, have been made on these Slavonians if Boso had taught them to sing the Slavonian Po milui.

Excited anew by the oppressions they suffered, the Slavonian tribes repeatedly broke away from the yoke imposed on them, until at last it became possible, though not before a great portion of the people were exterminated, and their national existence destroyed, to bring about, in a way contradictory to the very essence of Christianity, the establishment of the church among them.\*

The emperor Otho I. availed himself of the victories gained by his predecessor, Henry I., and by himself, over the Slavonian tribes in Germany, to give a firm shaping to the new Wend-German church, by founding several bishoprics; and, in so doing, he took pains to fill these bishoprics with men already distinguished for their zeal in promoting the diffusion of Christianity among these tribes. In 946 he founded the bishopric at Havelberg; in 948 the bishopric at Altenburg, or Oldenburg, among the Obotrites, one of the principal seats of the Slavonian power in Germany. This last-named bishopric became extremely rich, and the bishops could make use of their wealth as a means of binding the Slavonian population, and their princes, to themselves. Furthermore, in 963 he founded the bishoprics of Meissen, Merseburg, Zeitz (which latter bishopric was transferred, in 1029, to the stronger city of Naumburg); and, in 968, he gave the new Slavonian church, with the concurrence of pope John XIII., a fixed central point, in the archbishopric founded at Magdeburg.† It was the emperor's design that the bishopric of Oldenburg, like the

\* Adam of Bremen and Helmold agree in stating that the oppressions and extortions practised against the Slavonians threw obstacles in the way of their conversion. Adam of Bremen cites the remark which he heard from the lips of the then king of Denmark: "Populos Slavorum jamdudum procul dubio facile converti posse ad Christianitatem, nisi Saxonum obstitisset avaritia. Quibus mens prior est ad pensiones vectigalium, quam ad conversionem gentilium. Nec attendunt miseri quantum sue cupiditatis luant periculum, qui Christianitatem in Slavonia primo per avaritiam turbaverunt, deinde per crudelitatem subiecto ad rebellandum coegerunt et nunc salutem eorum, qui credere veulent, pecuniam solum exigendo contemnunt."

† See Helmold, I. I. c. 12.

other Slavenian bishoprics, should be subordinate to this common metropolis; but this plan was frustrated by the opposition of the archbishops of Hamburg, who asserted the claims of the ecclesiastical province originally assigned to them.\* The first archbishop of Magdeburg was Adalbert, from a monastery at Triers, who was ordained bishop, with a view to preach the gospel to the Slavonians on the island of Rügen.† Having found it impossible, however, to get any access to the minds of the people, he presided for some time over the abbey of Weissenburg, when a new and wider field of labour among the Slavonians was opened to him, as archbishop of Magdeburg.‡

But new oppressions and insults led to a new and general insurrection of the Wends. One of their chiefs, by name Mistiwoi, who had been a Christian, and attached himself to the service of German sovereigns, was exasperated by a personal injury. In 983 he collected together his countrymen for a new contest at Rethre, the principal seat of the Wendish worship, and hence also the central point of the nation; and soon Northern Germany was wasted by fire and sword. Every Christian foundation was destroyed with unsparing fury; and paganism stood erect again among these Slavonians. Yet Christianity must have left a more enduring impression on the mind of the Wendish chief himself; and when his passions had time to subside, he probably contemplated what he had lost, with repentance and regret. As his countrymen refused to take him while he remained a Christian he finally left them, to spend the remainder of his days, as a Christian, at Bardewik.§

A somewhat similar change in the course of his religious convictions was experienced by Gottschalk, an uncle of this Mistiwoi, whose life forms an important epoch in the history of the conversion of Slavonian tribes in Germany. Educated in a school at Luneburg, he received a Christian training, when the news of the murder of his father, the Wendish prince Udo, so wrought upon his mind, that he fled from Luneburg, determined to revenge his father's death on the enemies of his people.|| The spirited and enterprising youth collected together his countrymen for a new and bloody war, and spread havoc

\* L. e. c. 1.

† Or the Russians. See further on

‡ See the old *Narratio de erectio ecclesiae Magdeburgensis* in Meibom.

§ *Scriptores rerum Germ.* T. I. f. 734.

§ Helmold, I. c. 16

|| Helmold, I. c. 19.

and desolation over North-Albingia, in the district of Hamburg and Holstein. But the Christian feelings, instilled into him by his religious education, could not be wholly suppressed at once; and it so happened that, on a certain occasion, while surveying the scene of desolation which he had created, and beholding a once populous and highly-cultivated district, which had been sprinkled over with numerous churches, converted into a barren waste, he was seized with deep pangs of remorse at the reflection that all this misery was caused by himself; his conscience was aroused, and he felt constrained to make restitution for the wrong, and once more consecrate his life to the religion in which he had been educated. This Gottschalk became, in 1047, the founder of a great Wendish kingdom. The whole aspect of things was now changed; for a chief sprung from the people themselves, and animated by a sincere love of his countrymen, was striving to impart to them, out of a true regard for their well-being, Christianity and Christian culture. Gottschalk sent in every direction for clergymen to come and labour among his people, which was attended, however, with this great disadvantage, that many of them were ignorant of the Slavonian language. Gottschalk contributed his own efforts to remedy this deficiency. In the church he often addressed exhortatory discourses to the people, and translated for them the forms of the Latin liturgy, which the bishops and priests used, into the Slavonian tongue.\* New churches and monasteries were founded at Lubec, Oldesbu-<sup>g</sup>, Ratzeburg, Lentzen (Leontium), Mecklenburg, a principal place of the Obotrites (not far from Wismar). Adalbert or Albrecht, archbishop of Bremen or Hamburg, encouraged him, in an interview at Hamburg, to steadfastness in defending the faith, and to perseverance in zeal for its diffusion. Bremen being at that time the central point for the missions of the North, where banished bishops, clergymen, and monks, from all quarters, gathered around him, for whom he had to provide the means of subsistence, Albrecht joyfully welcomed the oppor-

\* \* Princeps Godescalcus tanto religionis exarsit studio, ut ordinis sui oblitus, frequenter in ecclesia sermonem exhortationis ad populum fecerit, ea quæ mystice ab episcopis et presbyteris dicebantur, Sclovonicis verbis cupiens reddere planiora. Adam. Bremens. hist. eccles. c. 138. Agreeing to a word, as generally in this section respecting Gottschalk, Helm. Chronica Slavor. l. I. c. 20.

anity which was now offered to him of assigning them elsewhere, a field of labour;\* though it must be confessed that such persons were not always the best qualified to act as missionaries among the Slavonians. With his zeal for the diffusion of Christianity, this prelate united an ambition to appear as a patriarch of the North; and this induced him, for the purpose of multiplying the number of bishoprics under his care, to divide one bishopric of Oldenburg into three, and to found two other bishoprics at Ratzeburg and Mecklenburg,† which may have been a salutary thing for the new church among a rude people that needed careful oversight. Yet this new ecclesiastical creation was soon destroyed.

Though Gottschalk had converted a large portion of his people to Christianity, at least to all appearance, yet the heathen portion, whose fury he had roused against him by his zeal for the spread of Christianity, and by the alliances which he had formed with the Christian princes of Germany, was still too strong; and the devout king fell a sacrifice to his zeal. On the 9th of June, A. D. 1066, he perished as a martyr at Leutzen,‡ together with the priest Ebbo (Eppo), who was sacrificed on the altar, and many ecclesiastics and laymen, who were made to suffer a variety of tortures. The monk Ansverus and others were stoned to death near Ratzeburg. This monk§ is said to have entreated the pagans that they would first stone his companions, for whose steadfastness he had faith; and when these had suffered martyrdom, he fell cheerfully on his knees, and offered up his life. The old bishop, John of Mecklenburg, was first beaten all over with clubs, then dragged in mockery through the several cities of the Slavonians, and, as he would not deny the faith, his hands and feet being first cut off, his head was fixed upon a pole, carried about in triumph, and offered to the Wendish god Radegost in the temple at Rethre (see above, p. 447); and

\* Adam of Bremen, c. 142. *Ut parvula Brema ex illius virtute instar Romæ divulgata ab omnibus terrarum partibus devote petretur, maxime ab aquilonalibus populis;*—and Helmold, I. I. c. 22. *Confuebant ergo in curiam ejus multi sacerdotes et religiosi, plerique etiam episcopi, qui sedibus suis exturbati, mensæ ejus erant participes, quorum sarcina ipse alleviari cupiens, transmisit eos in latitudinem gentium.*

† Helmold, I. c. 22.

‡ Adam of Bremen: *Passus est noster Maccabæus.*

§ See Adam of Bremen, c. 166, and the appendix, Helmold, I. c. 22.

these cruelties were the beginning of a new, general, and fierce revolt among the Slavonians. Those who continued steadfast in their faith were murdered. The adjacent Christian provinces became once more a scene of desolation.

In this period, was laid also the foundation of the Russian church; indeed, the first seeds of Christianity are said to have been conveyed among the Russians about the time they began to be united in one monarchy under the foreign prince Rurik, sprung from the Norman race of the Waragians. In spreading themselves to the southern parts of the present Russia, on the borders of the Roman empire in the East, they were, like other nations in the like circumstances, made acquainted with Christianity; and Greek emperors and patriarchs of Constantinople were induced to make attempts for their conversion. In the circular letter issued by the patriarch Photius, in 866, against the Latin church, he notices, among other things, that the people called Russians,\* hitherto noted for their barbarism and cruelty, had forsaken idolatry, received Christianity and allowed a bishop to be placed over them.† Photius, without doubt, describes the change said to have been produced by means of the Greek church among the Russians, in a boastful and exaggerated style; but *some* truth no doubt lies at the bottom of this exaggerated representation. These attempts to introduce Christianity among the Russians seem to have been continued also by the emperor Basilius the Macedonian, and the restored patriarch Ignatius, of Constantinople; though here also, the exaggerated accounts of Greek historians,‡ mixed with those fables which so easily sprung up and spread among the Greeks of this period, are not entitled to absolute confidence. The commercial intercourse, as well as the wars of the Russians with the Greek empire, the enlistment of the Waragians in the service of the Byzantine government, all this contributed to bring it about, that in the succeeding times of the ninth and tenth centuries, many seeds of Christianity were scattered anew among the Russians, without being followed, however, by conversions to any great extent. When in the year 945, the Russian grand prince Igur concluded a treaty of peace with the Greek

\* Τὸν ἰδόν τὸ καλούμενον Πᾶς.

† Photii epistole ed. Montacut. f. 58.

‡ See e. g. Cedreni Annales ed. Basil. f. 484.

empire, the baptized Russians in the army who swore by the God of the Christians, and the pagans who swore by their Slavonian god Perun,\* were already distinguished in the articles of the treaty, and mention is made of a church dedicated to Elias at Kiew, the capital of the Russieo-Waragian empire.† This town seems to have been the most important centre for the diffusion of Christianity in these districts.‡ The rulers of the Russian empire were more taken up with other concerns, than with those relating to the interests of religion; and the very difference itself between the religion of the Waragians, the stock out of which the ruling dynasty had sprung, and who by virtue of their Norman descent were given to the religion of Odin, and that of the people devoted to the Slavonian idolatry, may have served to promote the more liberal tolerance of a third religion.

By witnessing the forms of Christian worship at Kiew, and by what they here learnt concerning Christianity, opportunity was now given to the Russians of comparing the old rude service of idols with Christianity, and thus it may have come about, that Olga, grand princess of Russia, was inspired with a desire of embracing the Christian faith. In 955, she made a journey, perhaps for this special purpose, to Constantinople, intending to receive baptism in the chief city of Christian culture; unless it may be supposed that she undertook the journey for some other cause, and was first induced by the impression made on her mind by witnessing the ceremonies of Christian worship on the spot, and by the persuasion of the Greeks, to receive the ordinance of baptism.§ She took at

\* See the treaty of peace in the Annals of the Russian monk and historian Nestor, who lived near the close of this period, in the translation of Schlözer, vol. IV. p. 95.

† L. c. p. 99.

‡ The three following towns, Dorstede, Bremen, and Kiew, were the most important metropolitan centres for the European missions in this period.

§ Nestor's Annals, l. c. Vol. V. p. 60. The Greek historians also relate this event. They name the grand duchess "Ελγα. See Cedren, Annal. l. c. f. 524, near the end. The emperor Constantine Porphyrogenetos, under whose reign this happened, has described, in his work on the ceremonies of the Byzantine court, the solemn reception of Olga at Constantinople; but in this connection he makes no mention of her baptism, this being foreign to the design of his work. See this work, ed. Niebuhr, vol. I. p. 594.

her baptism the name Helena. She by no means succeeded, however, in gaining over her son Svatoslav, and her people generally, to Christianity. Perhaps she had recourse, in the year 959 or 960, to the emperor Otho I., attracted by his fame, which had spread far and wide in every direction, and by the accounts given of the zeal he manifested for the conversion of the Slavonian tribes; perhaps by the ambassador whom she sent to his court she requested him to send her a bishop and priests.\* If this story really refers to the Russians, then the abovementioned Adalbert (p. 448), who afterwards became bishop of Magdeburg, visited that country, but was soon induced, by the unfortunate issue of his mission, to return home again to Germany.

Vladimir, uncle to the grand duchess, who had before been, a zealous pagan, was the first who began to waver in his religious opinions. Having rendered himself famous by his conquests far and wide, it is said that people of various nations, Bulgarians from the districts bordering on the Wolga, who,

\* The confounding together of Rugi (as the inhabitants of the island Rügen, but sometimes also the Russians are called) and of Russi, Ruscia gens, makes this story, which occurs in the old German chroniclers of the eleventh century, a matter of dispute. The question arises, whether the island of Rügen, or Russia is meant. The statement of the chroniclers, that the Russian grand duchess made this request to the emperor only in pretence (ficte), and that he was deceived by the Russians, cannot be considered as altogether inconsistent with the supposition that the empire of Russia is referred to; for her son being really an enemy of Christianity, and the people generally devoted to paganism, it might happen that the bishop sent to them from Germany was frightened away by the unfavourable reception which he met from the multitude, and it may have been unjustly inferred from the unsuccessful issue of the mission, that Olga had a bad object in view. But supposing the story to relate to the inhabitants of the island Rügen, it admits of being easily explained, that these latter, who were devoted pagans till down into the twelfth century, sent an embassy to the emperor with an entirely different object in view from that which they openly expressed, and that they purposely deceived him. But still it remains singular and unaccountable that several of the German chroniclers should so distinctly assert that it was the Russian princess *Helena, baptized at Constantinople*, who sent this embassy. Such a statement could not surely arise out of nothing. But one hypothesis then remains, unless the whole be referred to the Russians, viz. that two embassies, one of the Rugians and another of the Russians, were sent with different objects to the emperor, and that these two have been confounded together in the account. See the German accounts brought together in Schlözer's *Nestor*, V. p. 106.

unlike those dwelling near the Danube, were not devoted to Christianity but to Mohammedanism,—the Chazars who were Jews, also Greek and Latin Christians, sought to gain him over to their respective religions. He resolved on sending embassies to different countries, to obtain more accurate information with regard to the character of the different religions and modes of worship; and then to make his selection according to the reports which he received. Those of his messengers who went to Constantinople were invited to attend the whole service, even the celebration of the eucharist, in the great church of St. Sophia. The magnificence of the church, the solemn pomp of the worship according to the Greek rites, made a singular impression on the minds of these rude men, and the report of it which they sent back to their prince, determined him to embrace Christianity according to the Greek rites.\* Vladimir was baptized in the year 980, in the old Christian commercial city of Cherson (Kerssan on the western bank of the Dnieper), conquered by himself, and received at his baptism the name Wassily. He married the Greek princess Anna, and then took measures to introduce

\* Nestor's account, who lived partly in the same century with Vladimir (see Karamsim's History of Russia, translated by Hauenschild, Bd. I. p. 169: and Strahl. History of the Russian Church, Th. I. p. 61) agrees for the most part with the anonymous Greek accounts which Banduri has published, *Imperium Orient.* T. II. *Animadvers.* in *Constant. Porphyrgene.* f. 62. But the story published by Banduri from a Parisian manuscript is only a fragment; it presupposes many of the facts which occur in the Russian account. It begins by saying that the four messengers visited Rome: they are delighted with what they saw at Rome, but by what they beheld at Constantinople everything else is eclipsed. As they visited the church on a great festival, the multitude of lights, the melody of the music, then the preparation for the celebration of the eucharist, the hypo-deacons and deacons marching forth with torches and the flabellas, the solemn procession of the higher clergy, &c. filled them with astonishment. When, according to this Greek story, Cyril and Athanasius (which without doubt should be Methodius) are said to have visited Russia, and introduced among the natives their Slavonian alphabet, the inaccuracy of the account here becomes evident. And so also Basilus II. may have been here confounded with Basilus the Macedonian, and a later with some earlier missionary enterprise of the Greeks among the Russians. So too the story of the miracle wrought among the Russians (see above), which certainly belongs to the time of Basilus the Macedonian, is interwoven with this tale. The chronological date, as fixed by Nestor, deserves, beyond all doubt, the preference.●

Christianity among his people. To effect this object, he made use of his authority as ruler; the idols were destroyed, and the people were commanded to submit to baptism. Vast bodies of men and women appeared with their children on the banks of the Dnieper, and were baptized at one and the same time. Yet no sooner had this outward conversion been forcibly effected, than schools were established at Kiew, and the Cyrillic alphabet and Cyrillic translation of the Bible used for Christian instruction.\*

Vladimir's successor Jaroslaw, 1019—1054, endeavoured to advance still further the Christian culture of the people by schools, churches, and monasteries, and by arrangements for the translation of religious and theological books from the Greek into the Slavonian language of the country. At Kiew was founded the first archbishopric of the Russian church, and Jaroslaw was desirous of making it, and with it the entire Russian church, independent of the patriarch at Constantinople. This independence, however, was but a transitory appearance.

From Bohemia the Christian church was transplanted to Poland. Duke Mjesko or Miecislaw of Poland, the first Polish king, was persuaded by his queen, the Christian Bohemian princess Dambrowska, in the year 966, to receive baptism. The old pagan worship was only suppressed by force; the adoption of Christian customs was effected in the same way; hence paganism resisted for a long time a Christianity thus imposed on the people. By the establishment of several bishoprics and of an archbishopric at Gniézen, the organization of this church was afterwards completed.

The Hungarians, who emigrating from Asia, at the close of the ninth century and onwards, conquered Pannonia, destroyed the Moravian kingdom, and spread consternation over the south-eastern parts of Germany, settled down, it is true, in countries, where the Christian church had been long since established, and where they were surrounded by Christian nations; but they remained untouched by the influence of Christianity, and proved themselves to be enemies to all

\* This doubtless gave origin to that Greek story, involving an anachronism, about the mission of Cyril to the Russians, and the introduction of his Slavonian alphabet by himself.

Christian foundations, as nothing was spared in the destruction which they left behind them.\*

The connection of the Hungarians with the Greek empire, is said to have furnished the first occasion for missionary enterprise among that people. About the middle of the tenth century, it is reported that two Hungarian princes, Bulesudes and Gylas, were baptized at Constantinople; the latter of whom took back with him Hierotheos, a monk, as a bishop for his people.† But some question may arise with regard to the motives which induced these two princes, who were loaded with costly presents at Constantinople, to embrace Christianity. It is certain that Bulosudes soon fell away again from the Christianity which he may never have sincerely received to his former paganism; and the conversion of Gylas was followed, at least, by no important results. Yet Christianity seems to have been preserved alive in the family of Gylas. His daughter, Sarolta, made profession of Christianity; and, being married to the Hungarian prince Geisa, she made him also favourably disposed towards the same religion. We may add to this, that when the power of the Hungarians was broken, by the severe defeat they experienced in the war with the emperor Otho I. in 955, and by other unsuccessful wars in the next succeeding years, they were compelled to renounce their thirst for conquest, and, in particular, to enter into more peaceful relations with the German empire. Thus for the first time, from about the year 970, the bishops on the south-eastern borders of the German empire found it in their power to establish missions for the benefit of this people.‡ Pilgrim, bishop of Passau, drew up, in 974, for pope Benedict VI., a remarkable report

\* So says pope Benedict VII., or rather VI., in a letter which in the year 974 he wrote to the German archbishops, after having spoken of the diocese of the archbishopric of Lorch in Pannonia: "Qua (diocesis) jam multis retro aës temporibus ex viciniorum frequenti populatione barbarorum deserta et in solitudinem redacta, nullum Christianæ professionis habitatorem mensinet, namely, till the conquest of Hungary by the emperor Otho I., usque dum genitor pii imperatoris nostri bellico trophæo eorum vires retundit." See Mansi Concil. T. XIX. f. 53.

† See Cedren's Annals, f. 524.

‡ So Pilgrim, bishop of Passau, in 974, writes to pope Benedict VI.: "Neophyta Ungarorum gens, apud quam fædere pacto sub occasione pacis fiduciam summisimis operam exercere predicationis."

concerning the spread of Christianity in Hungary, which had been brought about under the influence of these new peaceful relations.\* He writes to the pope, that he had been earnestly solicited by the Hungarians, either to come to them in person, or to send them missionaries. He had sent to them monks, priests, and other ecclesiastics, and about five hundred Hungarians of both sexes had been baptized. Particularly instructive, with respect to the diffusion of Christianity in Hungary, as well as supported by internal evidences of probability, is his report concerning the secret Christians in Hungary. Many Christians were to be found among them, who had been carried away captives from different nations. But these had not been allowed to observe the Christian forms of worship. They could only get their children baptized clandestinely. Now, for the first time, they enjoyed complete religious freedom; they could build churches, and provide themselves with clergymen. They hastened in crowds to the spot where their children could be baptized; and, according to the bishop's report, their joy was as great, as if they had returned to their homes from a foreign land.† Pagans and Christians lived for a time peaceably together.‡ These communities, consisting of foreign Christians scattered among the pagan population, were certainly an important preparation for the further spread of Christianity. But when the bishop proceeds to say, that nearly all the people were ready to adopt the Christian faith, we must consider this, as well as many other of his sayings, as a somewhat exaggerated statement; since other accounts, which we shall presently cite, by no means confirm the supposition that the state of feeling was so universally propitious. Probably Pilgrim was led, by some particular interest of his own, to set forth his report on the progress of the mission among the Hungarians in somewhat exaggerated colours. The truth was that, like his prede-

\* This letter, afterwards received into Mansi's Collection of councils (l. c.), was first published, from a manuscript in the monastery of Reichersberg in Bavaria, by Gewold, in an appendix of diplomas to the Chronicon Monasterii Reichersbergensis. Monachii, 1611, p. 24.

† Grantulantur omnes tanquam de peregrinatione sua in patriam redditu.

‡ Ita concordes sunt pagani cum Christianis tantamque ad invicem habent familiaritatem, ut illic videatur Isaiae impleri prophetia: Iup. et agnus pascentur simul.

cessors, he was striving to assert his independence of the arch-bishopric of Salzburg; and he defended the dignity and rights of that ancient metropolis, the long since dilapidated city of Lorch (Laureacum), whose diocese stretched onward to Pannonia.\* And so we may suppose that, in his efforts to convince the pope (from whom, in fact, he obtained the fulfilment of his wishes) how necessary the restoration of this metropolis was to Pannonia, and to its subordinate bishoprics, he allowed himself to be betrayed into a somewhat exaggerated representation of this new sphere of labour in Hungary.†

Among the missionaries sent by this bishop to Hungary was Monk Wolfgang, who was afterwards made bishop of Regensburg. But the writer of his life relates, that he soon returned home again, having met with an indifferent reception from the people.‡ No doubt it may have been the case that, owing to political events which soon afterwards occurred, whereby the quiet of these districts was again disturbed, to the war between Otho II. and Duke Henry of Bavaria, the successful progress of the mission commenced by bishop Pilgrim was interrupted; but if the enterprises of Pilgrim were really attended, in the beginning, with the favourable results he describes, and were only interrupted by these unhappy political disturbances, some intimation might be expected to be given of these independent disturbing influences in the contemporaneous accounts; but these speak only of the general indifference and insensibility of the Hungarian people.

The banished archbishop, Adalbert of Prague (see above, p. 44'), endeavoured to do something, also, toward promoting

\* As pope Eugenius II., in his letter to Urolf, archbishop of Lorch, had restored this metropolis which is said to have had under it seven bishoprics. See the letter, first published in the above-mentioned Collection of councils, p. 17.

† As he writes to the pope: "Et est ibi messis quidem multa, operarii autem pauci. Inde quoque visum est jam necessarium esse, quatenus sanctitas vestra illuc jubet aliquos ordinari episcopos." And afterwards: "quod nimium grave ac valde onerosum est inibi, ut tot mei pontificii parochias solus praedicando circumneam."

‡ Dolebat enim idem pontifex, bishop Pilgrim of Passau, tantum colos in sulcis sterilibus expendere laborem. Mabillon Acta sanctorum. Sec. V. c. 18. f. 817.

the spread of Christianity in Hungary. He repaired to that country himself, where he left his favourite and beloved disciple, Radia. Both seem to have found access to the people, who were unwilling that Radia should leave the country; which appears from the fact, that Adalbert had directed him, if he could do no better, to escape secretly, and find his way back to him.\* From this it is at least evident, that the people were unwilling to lose their missionaries. But Adalbert himself, who, it must be confessed, wanted the true Christian patience necessary to endure the rudeness of a heathen people, was by no means satisfied with the effects of his preaching among the Hungarians. He seems to have found there a mixture of paganism and Christianity; and Geisa, though he had received baptism, still favoured this mixture of religions. To the reproaches made to him on this account, he opposed his lordly authority; and his wife, through whose influence he had first been led to favour Christianity, gave no evidence of a change produced by it, in her rude manners.†

Stephen, the son and successor of Geisa, who acceded to the throne in 997, was far more deeply affected by the influence of Christianity than his father. The preaching of Adalbert and other pious men, who visited Hungary, had probably made a stronger impression on him while a child.‡

\* He wrote to the princess Suroulta: "Papatem meum (my nursing) necessitas et usus postulat, tene, si non, propter Deum ad me mitti eum." But to Radia himself he wrote another note, to be handed to him in secret: "Si potes cum bona licentia, bene; si non, vel fuga fugiens tenta venire ad eum, qui te desiderio concupiscit, Adalbertum tuum." See Life of Adalbert, at the 23rd of April, s. 22, f. 195.

† Concerning Adalbert's labours in Hungary, it is said in the above cited history of his life (c. VI. s. 16. l. c. f. 192: Quibus (Hungarisi) ab errore suo parum mutatis umbram Christianitatis impressit; and of the wife (c. V. s. 22, f. 195): Qua duce erat Christianitas coepit; sed integrum miscebatur eum paganismo polluta religio et coepit esse deterior barbarismo languidus ac tepidus Christianismus. With this agrees what Dismar of Merseburg, in the beginning of the eighth book of his work above referred to, says of Geisa: Hic Deo vero variisque deorum vanitatibus inserviens, cum ab antistite suo ab hoc argueretur, inquit; divitiae mihi abundant et ad haec agenda libera facultas et ampla potestas est; and then he speaks of the intemperance of his wife, who, in a paroxysm of anger, had stabbed a man.

‡ By the narrative of the German chroniclers of this age it would appear that the baptism of Stephen, and his conversion to Christianity, were first occasioned by his contracting a marriage with Gisela. The

ately after he assumed the reins of government, he had to sustain a struggle with the powerful heathen party. A Hungarian prince, by name Kupan, had placed himself at the head of it, and disputed the possession of the throne. Stephen, in this war, relied on divine assistance. He made a vow to St. Martin, the patron saint of Pannonia, which was to be fulfilled in case he should gain by his intercessions the victory over his enemies.\* The victory being gained, for which he believed himself indebted to the assistance of God, whose worship he was determined to promote in every way throughout his kingdom, and to the intercession of St. Martin, he was more strongly confirmed in his zeal for Christianity. His religious and his political interests were closely connected. He sought alliance with the political and the ecclesiastical,† heads of Western Christendom. He married the Burgundian princess Gisela, widow of duke Henry of Bavaria, sister of St. Henry II., and kinswoman to the emperor Otho III.; and with the latter he entered into a strict alliance, which procured for him the royal dignity. He invited monks and clergymen from all quarters into his kingdom;‡ though it

Hungarian bishop Garthwig, who, many years afterwards, wrote the life of Stephen (in *Actis Sanct. 2 September*), says, on the other hand, that he was baptized and educated in Christianity by Adalbert. We might prefer the older reports to the later and more prejudiced, especially as these admit of being easily reconciled with the doubtful Christianity of Geisa. But the fact that Stephen, from the time he assumed, while yet a youth, the reins of government, came directly into opposition with paganism, would lead us rather to conjecture that, being filled with zeal for Christianity by his education from childhood, he was resolved, as soon as he had the power of so doing, to employ it for the purpose of establishing the Christian church. The German chroniclers seem indeed to have ascribed too much to German influence. But on the question whether Stephen was baptised by bishop Adalbert or not, nothing certain can be said, in the absence of more distinct accounts concerning the repeated missionary labours of Adalbert in Hungary.

\* He says himself, in the deed of privilege granted to the abbey of St. Martin, in fulfilment of this vow: *Singulare suffragium, quod per merita B. Martini in pugnitia mea expertus sum, memoria posterorum tradere curavi.* See *Ragnaldi Annales*, at the year 1232, No. 24, and in the *Actis Sanct.* at the 2nd September, the *commentarius praevius* to his biography, s. 15.

† The accounts respecting the latter, however, are exaggerated. In his exhortations to his son we find no indications of a peculiar devotion to the pope. See below, p. 460.

‡ In the life of two Polish monks, composed by a contemporary, bishop

may be doubted whether most of them were capable of instructing the people in their spoken language. He invariably showed the greatest respect for ecclesiastics and monks, and sought in every way to promote their influence among the people. He endeavoured to soften their manners, by new laws imbued with a more Christian spirit. Yet, certainly, many foreign means were also employed to effect the suppression of paganism and the introduction of Christianity; and the consequence of this was, that the Christianity thus imposed was not seldom rejected again; hence laws must be enacted for the punishment of apostacy from Christianity, and for its neglect; and hence later re-actions from paganism, which had been suppressed by force. When, in the year 1003, Stephen conquered Siebenburgen, he enforced the adoption of Christianity in that district, as also in a part of Wallachia.\*

In the exhortations and maxims of government which he drew up for the use of his son and successor, Emmerich (Henry), he has left behind him a proof of his devout temper of mind, as well as of that peculiar form of piety which was determined by the ecclesiastical spirit of his age.†

Maurus of Fünfkirchen. These two monks were Zoerard and Benedict, who came to Hungary for the purpose of assisting in the establishment of the new church: Tempore illo, quo sub Christianissimi Stephani regis nutu nomen et religio Deitatis in Pannonia rudis adhuc pullulabat, audita fama boni rectoris, multi ex terris alis canonici et monachi ad ipsum; quasi ad patrem confluerebat. See Acta Sanctorum mens. Jul. T. IV. f. 326.

\* The law of Stephen: *Si quis observatione Christianitatis neglecta et negligentiæ stoliditate elatus, quid in eam commiserit, juxta qualitatem offendit ab episcopo suo per disciplinam canonum judicetur.* If he refused to submit to the penalty imposed on him it should be made more severe. *Tandem si per omnia resistens inveniatur, regali judicio coicilicet defensori Christianitatis tradatur.* See Actis Sanct. mens. Sept. T. I. § 548.

† He says, among other things, to him, *Observatio orationis maxima acquisitio est regalis salutis.* Continua oratio est peccatorum ablutio et remissio. He advises him, whenever he goes to church, to imitate the example of king Solomon, and pray to God for wisdom, 1 Kings, c. iii. Well worthy of notice is the manner in which he speaks of the church, as the community of saints founded on Christ, the Rock; for this interpretation of Stephen's words is, after all, the most natural, judging from the connection; though it is not to be denied, as has been observed in opposition to this view, that in the Latinity of this period the reflexive *pro*-*nos* is often used instead of the demonstrative. The words are as follows:—

By his pious zeal, and meritorious efforts for the extension of the Christian church, Stephen attained to the honours of a saint. But it was, as we have already intimated, in consequence of the manner in which the Christian church was planted by him in Hungary, that the way was prepared for a reaction by a pagan opposition-party, who had made some attempts at insurrection even under the reign of Stephen himself, and who continued them into the succeeding times,—a party opposed to the political, as well as the religious principles by which Stephen aimed to change the condition of the people.\* Twice in the course of the eleventh century this party succeeded in re-establishing the pagan worship, to accomplish which they took advantage of the political revolutions in 1045 and 1060, under king Andrew and king Bela; yet these were but transient efforts; and by force or by craft, the Christian monarchs contrived to defeat the opposition.†

Such were the facts connected with the extension of Christianity in this period. We must now turn to the opposite side, and consider the checks and hindrances which it had to encounter. In the preceding period, we took notice of the check which was given to the progress of the Christian church in Spain by the supremacy of the Mohammedan Arabians. Still the Christians were allowed by the laws to enjoy the free exercise of their religion, and on this score they suffered from the civil authorities no disturbance or restraint whatsoever. Thus they remained down to the year 850 in the full enjoyment of tranquillity and peace. Christians were employed at court, and in the administration of civil and military trusts, without a suspicion being excited that they were acting inconsistently with their religious convictions.‡ Clergymen and

Ipse Dominus dixit Petro, quem custodem magistrumque eidem posuit sancte ecclesiae; tu es Petrus et super hanc petram ædificabo ecclesiam meam. Se ipsum quidem nominabat petram, verum non ligneam vel lapideam super se ædificatam ecclesiam dixit; sed populum acquisitionis, gentem electam, divinam, gregem fidei doctum, baptismate lotum, christi-  
mate unctum, sanctam super se ædificatam ecclesiam dixit. See Acta Sanct. l. c. f. 544.

\* Yet even Stephen had exhorted his son to respect the ancient national spirit. Quis Græcus regeret Latinos Græcis moribus? aut quis Latinus Græcos Latinis regeret moribus? nullus.

† See Joh. de Thwroez Chronica Hungarorum, c. 42 and c. 45, in Schwandtner. Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum, T. I.

‡ See many examples in the Memoriale Sanctorum of the presbyter

#### PERSECUTIONS IN SPAIN.

monks, who were skilled alike in the Arabic and Latin tongues, were preferred before all others as translators in the negotiations with Christian princes.\* Men who regarded the preservation of the ancient culture, which had arisen from the study of Roman literature, and the Scriptural knowledge drawn from the Latin versions of the Bible, as matters of supreme importance, complained that the youth neglected the Latin and Christian literature for the Arabian and Mohammedan.† Marriages were not seldom contracted between Mohammedans and Christians; and in such cases it sometimes happened, that the husband converted the wife, or the wife the husband, to Christianity; that children, educated as Mohammedans, became Christians; and fierce contentions sprung up between brothers and sisters, when one followed the faith of the father, the other that of the mother. But under such circumstances, persecutions might easily be engendered; since, according to the Mohammedan laws, apostacy from that faith must be punished with death. And though the Christians were not otherwise oppressed by the civil authorities, than by being obliged to pay monthly a high poll-tax, and were not disturbed in the free exercise of their worship which was guaranteed to them by the laws, yet the signs of the Christian profession could hardly fail to expose them, in the midst of Mohammedan fanaticism, to various sorts of insult and abuse.

Eulogius of Cordova, which is an important source of information with regard to the condition of the Christian church at this time in Spain; to be found in the IV. vol. of Schott's Hispania illustrata, and in the Bibliotheca of the church-fathers, and in another important work connected with this subject, the Indiculus luminosus, composed by Paulus Alvarus of Cordova, a friend of Eulogius; also in the España Sagrada of Florez, T. XI. ed. III. Madrid, 1772, p. 219, f. s. 9. Qui palatino officio illorum jussis inserviunt.

\* The abbot Sanison, of Cordova, says in his Apologeticus, l. II. p. 385. España Sagrada, T. XI. Appellatus ex regio decreto ego ipse, quatenus, ut pridem facere consueveram, ex Chaldaeo sermone, in Latinum eloquium ipsas epistolas deberem transferre.

† With such a complaint Paul Alvarus concludes his Indiculus Luminosus: Nonne omnes juvenes Christiani gentilicia eruditione præclaris, Arabico eloquio sublimati volumina Chaldaeorum avidissime tractant et ecclesiæ flumina de paradiſo manantia quasi vilissima contemnentes, Heu pro dolor! linguam suam nesciunt Christiani, et linguam propriam non advertunt latini, ita ut omni Christi collegio vix inveniatur unus in millesimo hominum numero, qui salutatorias fratri possit rationabiliter dirigere literas.

from the populace. Clergymen could not appear in public without being accosted by the fanatical multitude with jeers and scoffings. Boys cried after them in the streets, stones were thrown at them. Whenever the dead were buried with the usual solemnities of the church, the infidels were followed by the populace with curses. The ringing of the church-bells afforded occasion for abusing the Christians and the objects of their faith.\* By such insults, men might easily be excited, especially in this sultry climate, to retaliate wrong for wrong, and ridicule the prophet of the Arabians. From words, they would proceed to acts; and this perhaps proved the occasion of the first effusion of Christian blood; for in accordance with the principles of the Koran, a law had been enacted, that whosoever blasphemed the prophet, or offered to strike one of the faithful, should be punished with death. Whosoever insulted one of the faithful, should be scourged.†

\* This situation of the Christians is described by men who afterwards defended the martyrs from the reproach of having been the means of interrupting the relations which secured the Christians in the enjoyment of peace and quiet. Thus Paulus Alvarus says, in opposition to those who boasted of the peace which had been enjoyed till that time (Indiculus Luminosus, p. 229), *Quotidie opprobiis et mille contumeliarum feciibus obruti persecutionem non dicimus nos habere! Nam, ut alia taceant; certe dum defuntarum corpora a sacerdotibus vident humo dando portare, nonne apertissimi vocibus dicunt: Deus non miserearis illis, et lapidibus sacerdotes Domini impetentes, ignominiosis verbis populum Domini derotantes, etc. Sic itidem cum et sacerdotes lapides, ante vestigia eorum revolentes ac infami nomine derogantes, vulgari proverbio et cantico in honesto suggillant, et fidei signum (the sign of the cross, which the Mohammedans, though they recognized Christ as a prophet, yet refused to respect, because, according to a story received into the Koran, they supposed some other person was crucified in the place of Christ), opprobrioso elogio decolorant. Sed cum basilice signum, hoc est tinnientis uris sonitum, qui pro conventu ecclesiae adunando horis omnibus canonicis percutitur, audiunt, infanda iterando congeminant, et omnem sextam universamque etatem milleno contumeliarum infamio maledice impetunt. So Eulogius, in the Memoriale Sanctorum, l. I. l. c. f. 247: Causa religionis eorum saevitiam ubique perpetimur, adeo ut multi ex iis tactu indumentorum suorum nos indignos dijudicent, propriusque sibi mett accedere execerentur, magnam scilicet coinquinationem existimantes, si in aliquo rerum suarum admisceamur.*

† That blasphemy of the prophet was to be punished with death appears from the history of the martyrs; and when the abbot John of St. Gorze, near Metz, visited Cordova as ambassador of the emperor Otho I., he heard this rated: *Eis in legibus primum dirumque est, ne quis in religionem eorum quid unquam audeat loqui, civis sit vel extra-*

The Christians themselves, however, were not of one mind with regard to the principles of conduct which duty required them to observe under these difficult circumstances ; but, as in earlier times,\* they were divided into two parties, the rigid and the more liberal. The one party thanked God for the liberty allowed to Christians, even under the rule of unbelievers, to confess and to practise the principles of their faith. They thought everything ought to be done to preserve inviolate this liberty of conscience and security ; that, conformably to the Scriptural precept, every act should be avoided which could furnish the unbelievers any occasion, real or apparent, for persecuting the Christians ; that all abusive language should be carefully avoided. They considered it a duty to employ every means, not involving a denial of the faith, to preserve and foster the friendly relations subsisting between them and the Mohammedan magistrates. Nor would they hesitate to accept offices under them, and in so doing sought to avoid everything that might give offence. Others, on the contrary, looked upon such conduct as being already a violation of the duty to confess Christ before men, and not to be ashamed of ~~it~~. Paul Alvarus, of Cordova, one of the fiercest representatives of this class, casts it as a reproach upon the Christians, that by accepting offices at court they became guilty of participating in infidelity, since they were afraid to pray and cross themselves before the unbelievers, and dared not openly confess the deity of Christ in their presence, but mentioned him only as the Word of God and the Spirit, titles which were also given to him in the Koran.† He styles them leopards, taking upon themselves every colour. He accuses them of adopting Chris-

neus, nulla intercedeute redemptione capita plectitur. The king himself forfeited his life, in case he heard such blasphemy, and failed to punish it with death. See the Vita Joannis Abbatis Gorziensis, at the 27th of February, s. 120, f. 712. In the Indiculus Luminosus, s. 6, is cited the law : *ut qui blasphemaverit, flagelletur, et qui percuaserit, occidatur.* That the blasphemare in this instance cannot refer to blaspheming of Mohammed may be gathered partly from the connection, and partly from the judicial mode of procedure already mentioned.

\* Vol. I. p. 266-267.

† In the Indiculus Luminosus, s. 9 : *Cum palam coram ethnicis orationem non faciunt, signo crucis oscitantes frontem non muniunt, Deum Christum non aperte coram eis, sed fugatis sermonibus proferunt, verbum Dei et Spiritum, ut illi asserunt, profitentes, suasque confessiones corde, quasi Deo omnia insipienti servantes.*

tianity only by halves.\* He says that, for the sake of the monarch's favour and of temporal aggrandizement, they were willing to take up the sword to defend unbelievers against their own brethren in the faith.† "Day and night," says he, "is heard from the turret (the minaret) the voice which blasphemers the Lord, by extolling at the same time with him, the lying prophet;‡ and wo to our times so poor in the wisdom of Christ, that no man can be found to erect, according to the command of the Lord, the banner of the cross over the mountains of Babylon and the dark towers of pride, and present to God an evening sacrifice.§

Both parties, by proceeding in these different directions, may very possibly have missed the course which should have been pursued; but in a case where such elements for violent collision already existed, and a religious tendency of the sort we have just described was lying at the bottom, it certainly needed but a slight occasion to provoke persecution on one side and a fanatical enthusiasm for martyrdom on the other.

Yet the first who suffered as a martyr in Spain by no means belonged to that fanatical class, but rather to the more prudent and temperate party. He was a priest by the name of

\* Quid his omnibus, nisi varietatem pardi zelo Dei zelantibus sibi  
inesse ostendunt, dum non integre, sed niedie Christianismum defendant?

† Contra fidei sue socios pro regis gratia et pro vendibilibus innumeribus et defensione gentilium praeliantes.

‡ This public proclamation, "There is no God but God, and Mohammed is his prophet," was a specially sore grievance to zealous Christians. They were wont, whenever they heard this cry, to pray God that he would deliver them from the sin they were obliged to hear, and repeated Ps. xcvii. 7, "Confounded be all they that serve graven images, that boast themselves of idols," words which certainly did not apply to the Mohammedans. Eulogius, of Cordova, who cites this in his *Apologeticus Martyrum*, f. 313, relates that his grandfather, whenever he heard this cry from the minaret, was wont to sign the cross on his forehead, exclaiming with a sigh, "Keep not thou silence, O God, for lo! thine enemies make a tumult, and they that hate thee have lifted up the head." Ps. lxxxiii. 1, 2.

§ Ecce et quotidie horis diurnis et nocturnis in turribus suis et in montibus caligosis Dominum maledicunt, dum vatem impudicum, perjurum, rabiidum, et iniquum, una cum Domino, testimoni voce extollunt. Et heu et um huic temporis nostro, sapientiae Christi egeno, in quo nullus invenitur, qui juxta jussum Domini tonantis aetherii super montes Babylonis caligosasque turres superbiz crucis fidei attollat vexillam sacrificium Deo offerens vespertinum.

Perfectus, attached to a monastery in Cordova, then the residential city of the Arabian caliphs. Some time in the year 850, under the reign of Abderhaman II., Perfectus, while on his way to the city to make some purchases for his convent, fell into company with a party of Arabians. They asked him many questions about Christianity, and the views entertained by the Christians respecting Mohammed. The last inquiry he strove to evade, telling them he was loth to answer it, because he feared he might annoy them by what he would be obliged to say. Finally, however, he concluded to inform them, since they invited him to speak frankly, and promised him that whatever he said, it should not be taken amiss. He then proceeded to represent Mohammed, for reasons which he assigned in detail, as one of the false prophets foretold by Christ among the signs of the last time. To all this the Arabians listened with ill-suppressed anger, yet for the present they let the priest go unharmed that they might not break their promise to him; but the next time he appeared in public they seized and dragged him before the judge, where they accused him as a blasphemer of Mohammed. It was the season of the Mohammedan fast. He was therefore for the present loaded with chains and thrown into prison. Some months afterwards, on the Mohammedan Easter, he was again brought forth; and, as he steadfastly confessed his faith, and instead of retracting only confirmed what he had said about Mohammed, he was condemned to death and perished by the sword.\* The long-repressed rage of the Mohammedans against the enemies of their faith having once broke loose, it soon found a second occasion for manifesting itself. John, a Christian merchant and a peculiar object of their hatred, was arraigned before the tribunal, where he was accused of having often blasphemed the prophet while disposing of his goods in the bazaar. As the charge could not be clearly proved, the judge attempted to force him to deny his faith by resorting to the scourge. After having been beaten till he was half dead, he was thrown into prison; then he was driven through the city, sitting backwards in an ass, with a herald proclaiming before him, "This is the punishment of the man who dares blaspheme the prophet;". but as he firmly persisted in confessing his faith, he too was

\* See Eulogii Memoriale Sanctorum, l. II. c. I. \*

executed.\* Next appeared before the judge a young man by the name of Isaac, from the monastery of Talanos, eight miles distant from Cordova, where an unusual degree of fanatical excitement prevailed. He pretended that he had come for the purpose of obtaining a better knowledge of the Mohammedan religion, with a view of embracing it. The judge, pleased with the idea of gaining so important a proselyte, took pains to expound to him the doctrine of the prophet; but great was his rage when the monk, instead of being convinced, undertook to refute what he advanced, at the same time vilifying Mohammed, whom he represented as a detestable impostor and seducer of mankind. The matter was reported to the caliph, who ordered the monk to be executed. A mistaken, fanatical zeal of this kind, to confess Christ before the unbelievers, now spread abroad like an infection, seizing upon that tendency to extravagant asceticism which existed before. From the mountains, deserts, and forests, monks came forth to lay down their lives for the truth.† Among these crowds, who, yielding to a fanatical impulse, sacrificed their lives without any reasonable object, were young men and women belonging to the first families of the land. Sometimes, however, they did not present themselves of their own accord as voluntary sacrifices; but Mohammedan relatives took advantage of their descent from Mohammedan families, whether on the father's or the mother's side, to complain of them as apostates. † Flora, for example, was a young unmarried woman descended from parents of mixed religion, her father being an Arabian and a Mohammedan, her mother a zealous Christian. The mother had educated her in Christianity, and from childhood she manifested a temper of sincere and ardent piety. Her brother being a bigoted Mohammedan, disputes could hardly fail to arise between the two on the matter of their faith; and the fanatical brother, when he found that all the pains he took to convert his sister were unavailing, grew exasperated against her. He accused her as an apostate: she

\* Eulog. I. I. c. f. 242, and the Indiculus luminosus, s. 5.

† Eulogius of Cordova says concerning the manner in which the example of martyrdom operated (Memoriale Sanctor. I. II. c. I. near the end): *Multos otio securae confessionis per deserta montium et nemora solitudinum in Dei contemplatione fruentes ad sponte et publice detestandum et maledicendum a sceleratum vatem exilire coegerit.*

‡ See Eulogius, Memoriale, I. II. c. 8.

## EULOGIUS AND ALVAR.

assured the judge that, on the contrary, she had never been a Mohammedan, but had been brought up from infancy as a Christian. The judge ordered her to be severely scourged that she might be forced to a denial; but as she continued stedfast, and never uttered a syllable against Mohammed, he dismissed her. She spent some time in retirement, but finally felt constrained to present herself again before the judge, and not only confess her own faith, but testify against Mohammedanism and its prophet. She did so, and was executed.

There were not wanting both ecclesiastics and laymen who disapproved altogether the conduct of those that were so ready to offer themselves as voluntary victims. These consisted partly of such as feared and wished to avert the bad consequences which threatened the peace of the Christians, and in part of such as were convinced that this was not the right way to confess Christ, but directly at variance with the teaching and example of our Lord and of the apostles. They looked upon such conduct as the effect of pride, from which no good could result, and as manifesting a want of that Christian love which ought to be shown even unto unbelievers. They knew that reviling and abuse formed no part of Christianity, and that by such means the kingdom of God could not be promoted.\* But two men, who at that time stood high in the veneration of Spanish Christians, the priest Eulogius, afterwards bishop of Toledo, and Paul Alvarus, his friend, hurried on by a fervent but passionate zeal, which lacked the cool composure of good sense, laboured in opposition to these more prudent views, and their whole influence went continually to kindle and cherish the flame of enthusiasm. The caliph Abderraman required the metropolitan Recafrid, archbishop of Seville, under whom the church of Cordova stood, to employ his ecclesiastical authority, which the caliph himself intended to back by that of the state, to restore the public tranquillity. The archbishop issued an ordinance, forbidding this uncalled for appearance before Mohammedan tribunals; and when Saul, bishop of Cordova, who was doubtless under the influence of Eulogius, stood forth in defence of the party attacked by the metropolitan, the latter caused all obstinate ecclesiastics, at the head of whom stood Eulogius, to be thrown into

\* See the *Memoriale of Eulogius*, l. I. f. 245.

prison.\* From his place of confinement Eulogius addressed to the Flora above mentioned, and to Mary, her friend and companion in suffering, a letter, exhorting them to confront martyrdom with firmness, and confirming them in the persuasion that they had done right in abusing the false prophet. The young women had been informed how much injury this conduct had done to the church; the communities had been deprived of their clergy, the priests lay in chains, no more offering could be made at the altars. He told them they should reply, a broken and contrite heart is a sacrifice well pleasing to God. Such a heart and a humble spirit would be accepted of God, even without any other offering. The Lord would not suffer his confessors to be put to shame; but that they had done wrong in abusing the false prophet whom men would persuade them to follow—this they could not own without denying the truth. As it is the peculiar method of enthusiasm to direct every feeling at a single point, leaving every other human interest, which Christianity holds sacred, to contemptuous neglect, so it was in the case of Eulogius. Following this peculiar bent, he exhorted those who aspired after the crown of martyrdom, but by many domestic ties were still reminded of the duty of self-preservation, to rise above all such subordinate considerations.

• A young man, Aurelius, descended on his father's side from a Mohammedan, and on his mother's from a Christian family, but who had lost his parents in early life, went to live with his aunt, a pious Christian, under whose care he was brought up; and by the lessons of Christian piety with which she imbued his mind, he escaped the influence of his Mohammedan teachers, who, while they instructed him in Arabic literature, endeavoured at the same time to gain him over to their religion. He remained a zealous Christian. Next he married Sabigotha, a young woman of like Christian zeal, who also, by a particular providence, had been saved from the influence of Mohammedanism, and conducted to Christianity. Both her parents were Mohammedan; but her father having

\* See the Life of Eulogius, by Alvar, in Schott IV. f. 224, also in the Actis Sanctorum, in Vol. II. at the 11th of March. See c. II. Eulogius was confined at first in one of the subterranean chambers, or caverns, which were first used by the Arabians of Spain as dungeons, and then were afterwards made to serve the same purpose.

died early, her mother married a second husband, who was secretly a Christian. The latter took every pains to convert his wife to Christianity, as well as to train up his step-daughter in the same faith; and she received baptism. Aurelius was a witness of the transaction, when John the merchant, after enduring so much suffering, was exposed to the insults of the multitude. This spectacle led both him and his wife to resolve on preparing themselves, by a rigidly ascetic life, for the suffering of martyrdom. But the anxiety which he felt for his two young children, who, left behind as orphans, would be surrendered over to the influence of Mohammedanism, still kept him back. He made known his scruples to Eulogius. The latter exhorted him not to allow himself to be deterred by such considerations from following his call to wear the crown of martyrdom; but to place his trust in God, the Father of the fatherless, who, without his aid, could preserve his children in the faith; pointing him to children of Christian parents, who had apostatized from the faith, and to other children of unbelieving parents, who had been led to embrace it. Aurelius, together with his wife, afterwards found the martyrdom which they sought.\* Two other Christians, one an old, the other a young man, repaired to a mosque where the people were assembled, and, as preachers of repentance, announced the wrath of God against unbelievers, while they reviled Mohammedanism and the false prophet.† The assembled multitude were excited to a frenzy of madness, and the two Christians would have been torn in pieces, had not the civil authorities interposed, and conveyed them off. As they had desecrated the holy place, they were sentenced, first to lose their hands and legs, and then to be beheaded. These incidents aroused the suspicions and anxiety of the caliph, and the Christians were threatened with a general persecution. Many were executed; many sought safety in flight, and wandered about without a home. Even such as partook at first in the enthusiasm of the martyrs, now declared against them; they imputed it to them that the quiet of the church

\* See Eulog. Memoriale Sanctorum, I. II. c. 10. Eulogius states that the daughter, left an orphan when eight years old, begged him to give an account of the life and sufferings of her parents. When Eulogius then asked her what she would give him for it, she answered: Father, I will pray the Lord to reward thee with Paradise.

† L. c. I. II. c. 13.

had been destroyed, and pronounced them the authors of all the evils which the Christians were now called to suffer. The caliph required the two Spanish metropolitans, the archbishops of Toledo and of Seville, to call an ecclesiastical assembly, for the purpose of devising measures to prevent these disturbances of the public tranquillity ; and a council at Cordova, in the year 852, made an ordinance, that for the future no one should rush unbidden to make confession before the magistrate.\* Soon after the caliph Abderhaman died, and his successor, Mohammed, dismissed every Christian from the places of trust at court and in the state. Under his reign, their situation became more unpleasant than ever ; while there were individuals still who presented themselves before the tribunals, and courted martyrdom. Many were driven by fear to deny. Eulogius, who by his exhortations had stimulated numbers to confess and suffer martyrdom, was himself one of the very last victims. The occasion was as follows.† Leocritia, a young woman, belonging to a considerable family wholly given to Mohammedanism, had in early childhood been won over to Christianity, and induced to receive baptism, by the pious efforts of a relative who was a devoted Christian. In vain did her parents seek, by friendly words, then by threats, and finally by corporeal chastisement, to bring her off from Christianity ; but, as Alvarus says, the flame which Christ had enkindled in the hearts of the faithful, could be subdued neither by fear nor by force. That she might not expose her faith, however, to constant jeopardy, but live in the free enjoyment of it, she resolved to flee from her parents' house, and contrived, by means of Eulogius, the main support of all who suffered from the faith, that a secret place of refuge should be provided for her. But her exasperated parents succeeded in discovering the place of her retreat ; and, with her, Eulogius was dragged before the tribunal. He steadfastly confessed his faith, vilifying Mohammed and his doctrine.

\* Eulogius says (l. II. c. 15. l. c.), that out of fear they dared not openly express their convictions ; that they resorted to dissimulation, to an equivocation which he thought inexcusable (non inculpabile simulatio in consulum), in that they were still for holding in honour the memory of those martyrs. To be sure, Eulogius, with all his enthusiasm for those martyrs, can hardly be considered an unprejudiced witness.

† Alvar. vita, c. 5.

In vain Mohammedans themselves, who respected him on account of his blameless life and extensive acquirements, told him that he was still at liberty to retract many things which he had said. He would not be shaken; and condemned to death, in the year 859, suffered the execution of his sentence with the utmost serenity and cheerfulness.

We have still to describe more fully the remarkable controversy, which at that time was carried on in Spain, respecting the veneration due to these martyrs. The two friends, Eulogius and Alvar, contended in their favour. The former wrote on this occasion his *Apology for the martyrs (Apologeticus martyrum)*, the second his *Luminous Exhibition (Indiculus luminosus)*. Eulogius cites the following objections of his opponents to the veneration of these martyrs. They were not worthy of comparison with the ancient martyrs; for they had not, like the latter, stood forth in the conflict with idolaters, but only with such as worshipped the same God as the Christians. They had not died like the latter a slow and painful, but a quick and easy death. They had not, like the latter, been signalized as saints by miracles. On the other hand, Eulogius maintained, that of none who refused to recognize Christ as being true God and true man, could it be said that they worship the same true God in common with the Christians. On the different form of death nothing depended; everything on the sameness of disposition, which gives martyrdom its significance in the sight of God,—zeal for God's glory and love for his kingdom, which disposition these confessors possessed in common with the older martyrs. In respect to miracles, they did not constitute the essential thing in faith, but were only given as the seal of faith to the church, when it was first about to be founded. As it was only by faith men could attain to the power of working miracles, so it was evident that faith had the precedence of miracles; and it remains even when miracles cease. Faith alone made martyrs: it was the root and foundation of all the virtues: it helped the wrestler, it helped the conqueror.\* Alvarus writes with more heat against his opponents. "The weak and timid may flee," says he, "but the

\* *Nihil est enim, quod sinceræ fidei denegetur, quia nec aliud a nobis Deus quam fidem exigit. Hanc diligit, hanc requirit, huic cuncta promittit et tribuit.*

strong and noble-hearted should fight." As the other side appealed to the words of Christ (Matt. x.), often quoted for the same purpose in the ancient church, where he bids those who are persecuted to flee from one city to another, he replied, "Indeed they should flee, but not to keep the sacred treasure concealed, but to proclaim it everywhere. By their preaching, those ancient Christians had provoked the persecuting spirit of the heathen. Many of the ancient witnesses had voluntarily sacrificed themselves according to the example of our Lord; they had attacked governors and kings with many an opprobrious word.\* You say the present is not a time of persecution; I say, on the contrary, it is not a time of the Apostles, because the shepherds from whom a flame of light should go forth to pierce the darkness of the unbelievers, want the apostolic zeal;—and he then proceeds to depict the shameful condition of the oppressed Christians. He next refutes the charge, that the Christians had first provoked the persecution by their uncalled for abuse of Mohammed. The first two martyrs, Perfectus the priest, and John the merchant, had not sought martyrdom, but had been forced to it by the unbelievers. Then after having endeavoured to show that the persecution had, in no sense whatever, been first excited by a voluntary self-offering of the Christians, he comes to speak of those whom he calls voluntary martyrs;† and describes them as men who were actuated not by human passion, but purely by a divine zeal; men who could oppose no check to their own course, but must necessarily follow their divine vocation.‡ If error, says he, must not be openly attacked, why did Christ come down to the earth? Why did he light up the eyes of the blind, without their asking, without their seeking their own conversion? Why have prophets and apostles been sent? But the proclamation of the gospel was not limited solely to the apostolic times; it was destined to reach through all ages, till all nations should be converted to the faith. Among the race of Ishmael, however, no preacher had as yet appeared, so that those confessors had first fulfilled

\* *Quod magis soliti estis reprehendere, multis contumeliis praesides et principes fatigasse.*

† *Spontanei martyres.*

‡ *Cohibere non valerunt cursum, quia conati sunt implere aeterni sui Domini iugum.*

for that race the apostolic calling.\* He ridicules those who could not discern in the martyrs the spirit of humility, love and meekness. In his zeal for the glory of God, he extols a holy cruelty, and holds up before them the example of Elijah, who slaughtered the priests of Baal, not with words, but with the sword.† He next considers the objection, that it was by means of those martyrs the communities were deprived of their priests, and the mass could not be celebrated. But he represents this as a divine judgment sent upon the despisers of the martyrs; and he proceeds to describe the manner in which it was customary to treat them. Those who ought to be pillars in the church, he says, appeared before the judges of their own accord, and accused these persons. Bishops, abbots, and nobles had combined to stigmatize them publicly as heretics; and martyrdom (that is, undoubtedly, voluntary self-offering) was forbidden to the people under pain of excommunication; men were bound under oaths not to do it, not to answer the revilings of the unbelievers by reviling.‡ He

\* We must own they laid down their testimony in a way which would necessarily confirm the unbelievers in their prejudice against Christianity, instead of bringing them nearer to the faith. They did just that which Christ describes as "casting pearls before swine." Occasionally, however, he so expresses himself as if the effect of this testimony was not to be taken into the account, as if it were not the spirit of love, which seeks the salvation of all, that spoke out of him; but he only meant, that the unbelievers, by having the opportunity of hearing the gospel proclaimed, should be left without any ground of excuse before the judgment seat of God. *Et certe non aperte ut omnis creatura evangelii prædicationem dixit recipiat, sed ut prædicatione ecclesie omni mundo generaliter clareat, per quod ministerium et prædicatoribus inferatur debitum præmium et contentoribus justissimum aeternum sine fine supplicium, and of those martyrs: isti apostolatus vicem in eosdem impleverunt cosdemque debitores fidei reddiderant.* What blindness of passion, to consider those unbelievers as debitores fidei, after such a preaching of the gospel!

† He says of his opponent, c. 11: *Qui in suis contumeliis elati, superboi sunt et inflexi et contra hostes Dei humiles, mansueti, simplices apertum et quieti; discant tamen a Christo, ab omnibus prophetis, apostoli, et patribus universis ad illata opprobria existere humiles et dejecti et pro divinitatis ulciscendum contentum fortes et rigidos esse debere et non pietate horum incongrua, sed crudelitate hac sancta utere.* We may surely discern already in this fiery Spaniard something of that spirit, which at a later period kindled up in Spain the fires of the Auto da fè.

‡ Cap. 15: *Tuos ecclesiastice interdiximus et a quibus ne aliquando ad martyrii surgerent palmam juramentum extorsimus, quibus errores gentilium infringere vetuimus et maledictum ne maledictionibus impeterent,*

includes this work with a fierce attack on Mohammedanism, which he describes as a religion wholly subservient to sense, and of Mohammed, whom he represents as a forerunner of Anti-Christ.\*

When the preponderant influence of the more thoughtful majority succeeded in putting a check on these fanatical extravagances, the Christians in Spain were permitted once more to enjoy their religious freedom. In the year 957, the monk John of the monastery of St. Gorze, near Metz, came to Spain as envoy of the emperor Otho I. He was warned by the Christians of that country against doing anything which might exert an unfavourable influence on the relation of the Christians to their rulers, and cause them to lose the free exercise of their religion, and their present quiet and security. A bishop said to him—"Our sins have brought upon us this foreign domination; and the precept of the apostle Paul (Rom. xiii. 2) forbids us to resist the powers that are ordained of God. But amid these great evils, it is still a comfort, that we are not prevented from living according to our own laws; that the Saracens esteem and love those whom they see observing conscientiously the Christian doctrines; that they gladly hold intercourse with them, while on the contrary they invariably avoid the society of the Jews. For the present, therefore, we consider it best, inasmuch as we are not molested in our religion, to obey them in everything which does not compromise our faith."†

evangelio et cruce educta vi jurare improbiter fecimus. We may see from this, how much pains the ecclesiastical authorities took, to repress these fanatical movements.

\* He says of him (c. 33): *Adversus Christum humiliatis magistrum erectus est et contra illius lenissima et jucunda præcepta contumacis, serbere, et gladio usus est.*

† *Vita Joannis Abbatis Gorziensis*, at the 27th of February, s. 122. 713.

LONDON :  
PRINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS,  
DUKE STREET, STAMFORD STREET.









